University of Alberta

Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading: A Developmental Study

by

Agnes M. Maynard

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Elementary Education

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2004

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-95981-3
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-95981-3

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing the Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou aturement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Acknowledgements

I thank my family, both far and near, old and young, for their unstinting support during the work on my dissertation. My family's love of reading was foundational to my love of reading. My son, Matthew, too was lucky enough to spend time with four generations of his family and see them all read at some point. Perhaps that is my gift to him – the time we spent together reading. He is a young man now who likes to read. I am proud of him. He, I think, is proud of me.

I thank my committee for their time and support. Looking back, I think, at times, I walked to a different drummer and required a different kind of patience, not more, not less, just different.

I thank my friends, colleagues, supervisory, and examining committee members.

I thank my supervisor, Dr. Linda Phillips. She led by example and always showed intelligence, warmth, and care. She urged and supported me whenever I needed help and stepped back when I needed to walk on my own. Thank you, Linda, for believing in me so that the research could be carried out and the dissertation completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1
Definition 2
Purpose of the Research 3
Significance of the Study 3
Theoretical Framework 4
Reading as a Social Event 10
The Role of Text 11
The Role of Affect 11
CHAPTER TWO: AFFECT AND READING: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 16
Reluctant Readers 24
Aliterate Readers 24
Reluctant Readers and Aliterate Readers 25
Resistant Readers 26
Avid Readers 31
Gender 33
Reading Instruction 37
CHAPTER THREE: DESIGN OF THE STUDY 40
Research Methodology 40
Research Setting 40
Participants 41
Ethical Considerations 43
Instruments 44
Pilot Study 47
Data Collection 47
Data Analysis 48
Reliability and Validity 51
Limitations 52
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 53
Positive Affect Plays a Dynamic Role in Reading Development 54
Reading as a Social Event 54

Role of Text 60
Role of Affect 63
Home Support is Fundamental to Positive Association and Negotiation 69
Reading as a Social Event with Siblings 70
Reading as a Social Event with Parents 72
Family Values 75
Learning How to Read 77
Resources 79
Time and Place 79
Choice 80
Ownership 82
Communities of Readers 83
Children are Vulnerable to Classroom Situations and Teacher Control 85
Reading as a Social Event with the Teacher 86
Role of Text: Computers and Books 88
Storybooks and fiction 89
Information books and expository texts 91
Reading preferences 93
Vocabulary Development 98
Resources 98
Time and Place 99
Choice 102
Role of Affect 104
Peer Perceptions are Not Neutral 105
Reading as a Social Event with Peers 106
Everybody Reads 107
Talking to Your Friends about Reading 110
Negative Affect 111
Teasing 112
Girls Read More Than Boys 112
Other Ways of Being Influenced by Peers 114

How Boys are Affected 116
Pleasure is a Function of Reading 118
Kindergarten 119
Grade Two 123
Grade Four 125
Gender 128
Kindergarten 128
Grade Two 130
Grade Four 133
Reading Achievement 134
Kindergarten 134
Grade Two 136
Grade Four 139
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND CONCLUDING THOUGHTS 146
Theoretical Implications of Affect 147
Applied Implications of Affect 150
Teacher Educators and Educational Professionals 151
Teacher Practice 152
School Practice and the Home Connection 154
Students 156
Differences in Affective Responses 156
Gender 156
Reading Proficiency 159
Affective Responses by Grade 161
Concluding Thoughts on Further Research 162
REFERENCES 165
APPENDIX A: PSEUDONYMS AND IDENTIFYING INFORMATION 176
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHERS, PARENTS, AND STUDENTS 177
APPENDIX C: CHILDREN'S AFFECT IN RESPONSE TO AND TOWARD READING PROFILE 181
APPENDIX D: POSSIBLE CATEGORIES BASED ON PILOT RESPONSES TO THE CARP 186

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: *Teacher Judgment of Student Reading Ability by Gender and Grade*.....42

Table 2: *Teacher judgment of reading ability of kindergarten students by gender and percentile range they obtained on the TERA-2*.....135

Table 3: *Teacher judgment of reading ability of grade 2 students by gender and percentile range they obtained on the TERA–2*.....137

Table 4: *Teacher judgment of reading ability of grade 4 students by gender and percentile range they obtained on the TERA-2*.....141

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Through the rather straightforward route of observing children both in the course of my work as a teacher-librarian and in my remedial reading classes, I became interested in the area of affect. As a teacher-librarian, I was able to see that some children who started out enjoying reading when they first came to school developed over time a disinclination to read. I began to wonder, why? For example, why would a little boy like reading in grade two but not in grade four? I, like most teachers it seems, was accustomed to the idea that junior high school students are not necessarily enamored with reading in school, but, what about younger students? Why the change in attitude? Why the turn in liking reading?

As a remedial reading teacher, part of my work was to instill a love of reading in children who had as far as I knew, not experienced reading as a joyful activity. I found with some children that they simply did not like particular genres. One boy in particular found narrative extremely difficult to internalize; it was as if he did not know how to approach it. For some children decoding was the puzzle they needed solved and for them it seemed overwhelming; decoding needed to be put into the perspective of meaning. Reducing fear sometimes seemed to be the biggest issue, but how did such fear develop?

My wondering about children grew beyond my classroom and the library to blossom into the subject of my research. I have learned from my research that there are many reasons for what may be a growing disinclination to read on the part of many children as they go through school. My research has also led to a way for teachers to converse with their students so that they may come to understand the power of children's affect in response to and toward reading.

Children start school with emotions, attitudes and beliefs already developed. For instance, children may come to school with positive affect towards reading and positive beliefs about their

own ability to read and learn. Schooling that supports and develops children's positive beliefs will likely engender greater and continued success in reading but, schooling must also mediate children's negative or neutral beliefs.

Research has tended to support the view that those children with neutral or negative affect towards reading at the outset of their schooling are disadvantaged and subsequently have their negative images confirmed as they proceed through school (Snow, Barnes, Chandler, Goodman, & Hemphill, 1991). Preliminary evidence has shown children are turning off from reading at a younger age than was previously believed, even though their early experience of reading may have been positive (Davies & Brember, 1993; Kush & Watkins, 1996; McKenna, Kear & Ellsworth, 1995). Therefore, regardless of their disposition, the evidence seemed to indicate that often children did not enjoy the sorts of schooling experiences needed to cultivate and sustain positive affect towards reading. Research was warranted to better understand children's affect in response to and toward reading and to study whether gender, grade level, and level of reading proficiency had an effect.

Definition

Three distinct aspects of affect relevant to reading research included affect as a class name for feeling or emotion including attitudes and beliefs that may be either positive or negative, affect as a single (cognitive) feeling response to a particular object, event, or person and affect as the general (evaluative) reaction toward something liked or disliked (English & English, 1958, p.15; Oatley & Nundy, 1996, p. 258,268; Snow, Corno & Jackson III, 1996, pp. 246-248). An integration of these aspects formed the definition adopted for my research. Affect means the class of emotions and feelings, including attitudes and beliefs, which can involve a single feeling response to a particular reading and a reaction toward reading generally.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of my research was to understand children's affect in response to and toward reading. Specifically, how can children's articulation of their affective responses at grades kindergarten, two and four inform a theoretical and applied understanding of reading? Further, do children's articulations of their affective responses differ, and if so, how do they differ in relation to: (a) gender; (b) levels of reading proficiency; and (c) grade?

Significance of the Study

The study of children's affect in response to and toward reading was important for the reasons outlined:

1. The study of children's affect in response to and toward reading could provide information on the source of children's dispositions toward reading, that is, whether it was home and those at home, school and those at school, teaching methods, reading materials, other mediating factors, or some combination of any of these. Other studies have indicated that each of these factors has at one time or another played an integral role as a source of children's reading attitudes. The study proposed was new in that children and not adults, identified which factors or elements of their reading experiences they thought helped to create positive affect that allowed them to learn to read and to want to continue to read to learn. And contrarily, children identified those factors or elements that they perceived hindered their ability to learn to read and to want to read to learn.
2. The study of children's affect in response to and toward reading would likely provide a method of discerning whether children's affect is positive, negative, or neutral. Such a method emanated from my research and could provide teachers a means to identify children's perceptions early in their schooling. Early monitoring would

potentially afford teachers the opportunity to consider changes to their teaching methods or materials in order to better develop children's reading affect in a positive direction. Knowledge of children's affect is currently not a primary focus within educational research (Gaffney & Anderson, 2000), nor does it appear to be a priority for classroom teachers (Morrow & Gambrell, 2000).

Theoretical Framework

Affect has not been a prominent theme in reading research (Gaffney & Anderson, 2000). The prominence of affect in educational contexts appeared to have been restricted by the acknowledged lack of clarity in the psychological literature (DeCorte, Greer & Verschaffel, 1996; Snow, Corno & Jackson, 1996), and perhaps as a consequence of the particular theoretical models and processes of reading in vogue up to now. Within the last half century, three major theoretical shifts were evident in the reading field from behaviorist to cognitive to sociocognitive. Behaviorist models focused more or less on the observable, the recitation by readers of what the author had written and upon decoding (Bruner, Matter & Papanek, 1955; Mathews, 1966). Early cognitive models expanded to account for how information is encoded in the text and the experiences of readers (Kintsch 1986, Simon, 1979). This expansion signaled the beginnings of an evolution away from an emphasis on reading as inherently a communicative act and toward an emphasis on reading as a more generative act wherein both meaning and significance are constructed by readers while reading. This construction of meaning by a reader, between the reader and the text, is seen to be fluid and transactional (Rosenblatt, 1978). The sociocognitive models focused on knowledge as socially patterned and conditioned, and what readers know they know as a result of their social experiences and interactions (Bakhtin, 1981; Vygotsky; 1978).

Sociocognitive models presented reading not as a communication act but rather as a knowledge construction mediated by social experiences. It is not surprising then, that affect was

not much more than a mere mention in the first two models of reading because the locus of control was outside the reader and hence, the role of affect was minimized. More recently, affect has been the subject of repeat calls for research (Guthrie & Alvermann, 1999; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000) largely because there has been increasing recognition that affect plays a fundamental role in reading acquisition and development. Reading theorists continue to emphasize the decoding aspects of early reading even though internal attention needed to read is influenced by affect (Gough, 1985; Samuels, 1994).

Other theorists (Goodman, 1994; Ruddell & Speaker, 1985; Ruddell & Unrau, 1994) emphasized the reader as a constructor of meaning from texts and included the notion of social contexts as contributing shapers of meaning. For example, within the school environment, children were seen as constructing/negotiating meaning in the classroom community. In my study, affect and cognition were considered as working together; they are "interconnected, interdependent, and interactive" (Ruddell & Unrau, 1994, p. 1002). Ruddell and Unrau stated that affect was concerned with motivation, attitude, content, stance and socio-cultural values and beliefs (p. 999). A problem with current theory however, is that although affect is taken to be an important part of the reading process (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000) and is viewed by teachers, parents and educators as important, reading for pleasure, for instance, is often not a priority with these very same groups. Children's affect still takes a backseat to skill development in reading in the classroom (Morrow & Gambrell, 2000). Morrow and Gambrell noted the concern that few teachers keep up with the field of children's literature and because of what may be seen as the basalization of children's literature, and the legitimization of phonics, emphasis on affect may be overshadowed by an emphasis on skills.

The role of affect before, during, and after reading depends both on one's perspective on affect, as well as how one defines affect. Some psychological theorists see affect as motivational

(Alexander & Murphy, 1999; Oatley & Nundy, 1996), for instance, Oatley and Nundy (1996) stated, "emotions are seen as related to action and the management of action...They connect what happens in the external world (events) to elements of the mind (goals and beliefs)" (p. 268). Oatley and Nundy claimed students' responses to an event, object or person may cause them to initiate changes in their actions, goals and beliefs. Others used affect to describe either a stimulus or a response, that is as either a cause or an effect (Izard, 2000, p. 88). Izard stated, "In psychology, affect is most frequently used as a description of a response – a mental or emotional state. Yet, psychologists generally recognize that affect is causal and that it influences perception, cognition, and behavioral action. Psychology adopted the adjectival form, affective, to denote the feeling or mental condition that arises from affect or emotion." (p. 88). Izard noted, "Many psychologists use the terms emotion and affect interchangeably", whilst others "use affect to describe any motivational condition" (p. 88). Still others, see affect as a preference for one stimulus over another which can be induced without participant awareness (Zajonc, 2000). Zajonc has claimed that affect can be induced in participants without their awareness through repeated exposure to a stimulus (in experiments, participants were exposed to a smiling face or frowning face and various Chinese ideographs). The results showed that preferences for specific ideographs were based on the smiling faces and that different parts of the brain are activated for preferences rather than for recall or memory (p. 46). Zajonc established, "there are conditions under which an affective reaction can occur prior to and independently of the participation of cognitive processes" (p. 32) and "...in everyday life they [affect and cognition] interact constantly and one seldom occurs without the other". However, within his own research, Zajonc proposed in principle affect and cognition are "conceptually, anatomically, and dynamically independent processes" (p. 47).

Some studies on attitudes and motivations for reading refer to attitudes as feelings, evaluations or behaviors or as some combination of all three toward reading (Davies & Brember,

1993; Goodwin, 1996; Greaney & Neuman, 1990; Kubis, 1994; Kush & Watkins, 1996; Ley, Schaer & Dismukes, 1994; Mitchell & Ley, 1996; Palmer, Codling & Gambrell, 1994; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). Others, see emotions as the outward observable behavior of inwardly-directed feelings (Damasio, 1999, p. 42), whereas others look to beliefs that underlie attitudes (McKenna, 1994). Frijda (1993) wrote of affect as awareness of pleasantness or unpleasantness, and different emotions are based on thinking and sensations in the body (p. 382). Whether we are talking about emotions, feelings, attitudes or beliefs, all come under the umbrella of affect. Specifically, readers' affect includes the emotions, feelings, attitudes and beliefs in response to reading specific texts, toward reading in general, as well as toward others participating in the reading experience(s).

It is difficult to find coherent, consistent and complete explanations of the role of affect in reading or mathematics, or any subject for that matter. There are numerous mentions of the role of affect but few explanations (see for example, DeCorte, Greer & Verschaffel, 1996), and among the few, studies were done almost twenty years apart and on different age populations and consequently, the role of affect appears to be different but complementary. I shall illustrate by appealing to the work of Athey and Holmes (1969) and Miall (1995).

Athey and Holmes (1969) used the term "affective mobilizers" to indicate "deep-seated value systems, the fundamental ideas that the individual holds of himself, and his developing relationship to his environment" (p. 5). In reading, they theorized that the mobilizer might be "the purpose of the reader, his attitude toward reading, the attitudes and emotions associated with certain types of material, the reader's feelings about himself, his life space, or the world in general" (p. 4). For Athey and Holmes, the "affective aspects of early childhood experiences" might form long term "non-verbalized but felt beliefs" (p. 5). The role of affect before reading could then be seen as one of creating a reading disposition or as Athey and Holmes noted when children are very young they start developing unvoiced beliefs that are learned from those around them and whose

actions have influence on their lives. They conducted a meta-analysis of the literature on reading success and personality characteristics of children in grades one to nine for a period of three decades. The majority of the research was represented in the following categories, self-concept, intellectual attitudes, identification with teachers, perception of reality, active mastery of the environment, autonomy and independence, and anxiety.

Athey and Holmes (1969) then replicated a study based on their analysis of good and poor readers in junior high school. They found that the early life experiences of junior high school students influenced not only their response to reading but also their approach to reading generally. Using four categories, namely, social independence, self-concept, school dislikes, and self-decision, they found that poor readers were non-argumentative, valued family and friends to the point of social dependence and did not like to read. Poor readers "try to be like someone in a book or show" (p. 38). They prefer the company of their parents to that of others, allow decisions to be made for them, and generally worry. Good readers, on the other hand, were more independent of their parents, more likely to like to read, to exercise their power over their reading, and thus, felt confident with their decisions about reading. Good and poor readers disliked aspects of school. Good readers disliked "the monotony of school work" (p. 37) and the inadequacies of teachers even though they expected their teachers to be interested in them. Being certain of who they are, they wanted to be treated as adults and be independent decision-makers. Poor readers disliked their classmates laughing at them when they read and believed their teachers disliked them. The characteristics described here for good and poor readers would seem to start with early affective experiences and then develop over time.

Miall (1995) in his research from a neuropsychological perspective, worked with university literary readers and found that feelings appeared to play a central role in initiating and directing the interpretive activities involved in reading and in how reading transforms the reader. He considered

the role of anticipation in reading and proposed, "feelings...appear to play a central role in initiating and directing the interpretative activities involved in the development of such complex activities as reading" (p. 279). Anticipation and feeling are components of literary reading. Literariness, as described by Miall and Kuiken (1999), is "constituted when stylistic or narrative variations defamiliarize conventionally understood referents and prompt reinterpretive tranformations of a conventional feeling or concept" (p. 123). The stylistic variations are called "foregrounding" and include phonetic, grammatical and semantic language in the text. It is these stylistic variations that give pause to the reader and indicate increased affect as reported by Miall in his earlier work (1995). The work of Bradley and Bryant (1985) for instance, showed that preschool children's play with rhyming and alliteration, two types of variations, influenced their success in learning to read and spell. Brown (1993) also working with preschoolers found their experiences with narratives, yet another type of stylistic variation, afforded them an exposure to language in order to develop their own boundaries of play and language. Affect thus plays a primary role in initiating and sustaining reader comprehension of text. Miall proposes that current research into emotions and how they are recognized in the brain, particularly right hemisphere studies, will enable us to come to further understanding of how reading transforms a reader's self-concept. My research was with emergent and developing readers for whom the challenge of learning to read was paramount. It seemed reasonable then to expect that the role of affect for them would be more or less foundational to that reported by Athey and Holmes on adolescent readers and by Miall and Kuiken on adult readers.

For the purposes of my research, reading was seen from a sociocognitive perspective, wherein reader knowledge, experience, and text are social constructions that require an integration of both the cognitive and affective domains. Readers engage in reading for many purposes: some are utilitarian, some are for purposes of self-development, and others are for reasons of pleasure. The nature of reader engagement may differ both cognitively and affectively but on the basis of

what is known about affect, in some contexts affect seems to lead cognition, rather than vice versa. However, affect and cognition interact and are contextually dependent. In this study, affect and not cognition was my main focus. For instance, children who have a strong interest in a subject, often persevere in coming to understand a text that is above their reading level. In other cases, sociocultural values influence whether boys show more or less interest in reading than do girls. Young readers having less knowledge of language, word analysis, and text-processing strategies, find reading more difficult and need to be taught that these difficulties are typical of most readers when they are learning to read or are reading different kinds of text for the first time. Reader engagement can also be affected by the situational context in which reading is taking place, whether it is thought to be a pleasant place (either at home or school, neither, or both). The role of affect in response to and toward reading would thus seem to be quite complex.

Affect is a psychological term for those emotions, feelings, attitudes and beliefs that lead to action. In the context of a sociocognitive model of reading, it seems reasonable to suggest that emotions, feelings, attitudes and beliefs, the substance of affect, do not occur in a vacuum. Affect is experienced in the context of some phenomenon or event; in my research the general context is reading. Reading for young children is most likely a social event both in school and at home.

Reading as a Social Event

While the text itself is a social construction by the author, it is with the ways that social interaction impacts upon young children's affect in response to and toward reading that I was most concerned. In the case of young children, the mother, father and siblings play a significant role in their development of engagement with reading (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). As the children grow older and develop friendships and acquaintances beyond the home, these others also play a significant role in their reading development (Almasi, 1995; Gee & Green, 1998). Schooling itself is a social event and presents young children with yet another reading setting with lots of people,

including a teacher, who may or may not demonstrate an interest in the children's interests, who may or may not be supportive of their independence, and toward whom the children may or may not be responsive especially when text choices are at issue (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).

The Role of Text

Within the reading experience, there is minimally a reader and a text. The physical characteristics of text are important and influence children's affect (Mathewson, 1976), but it is also the children's interest in (Schraw, Bruning, & Svoboda, 1995); their control of (Pressley, Rankin, & Yokoi, 1996); and, their engagement with the content that coordinates their strategies and knowledge in order to construct meanings, build theories, and take command of reading (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). Affect plays a significant role in the reading experience.

The Role of Affect

Given the increasing number of calls for research on affect and the acknowledgements that much theorizing and research is needed to understand affect, I thought that to make progress in some small measure toward understanding young children's affective responses to and toward reading it was necessary to examine the work of others as well as to extend it, even if that extension was preliminary and speculative.

Robeck and Wallace (1990) suggested that there were three sequential levels of complexity to affect, namely, associational, conceptual, and self-directed. I shall discuss these showing that each has a specific function and that each has a reciprocal function in the regulation and development of affect (though this reciprocal role is not explicit in Robeck and Wallace's work). Due to length considerations, only examples of positive experiences will be used for illustrative purposes here though negative and neutral experiences bear significant import and would bear differently upon the nature of one's affect.

According to Robeck and Wallace, association is the initial step in the awareness of an experience being pleasurable or unpleasurable and the initial link to whether to repeat or avoid an experience. For instance, if children find the experience of reading pleasurable, then it is likely that they will want to repeat the experience. The affective circumstances or conditions of the earlier experience including the people and the place involved are alive in memory and will influence subsequent reading experiences. It seems then that associations may be reciprocally both cognitive and affective because children must engage in reading in order to develop associations between the input and their response to it and in order to construct their own set of associations; what is meaningful and helpful for one will not necessarily work for others. When an experience is pleasurable and is repeated, affect advances to the conceptual level thereby allowing for development of further associations and advancement in children's thinking about the experience because they may be aware of their response at the associative level, but they may not be aware of the reasons for their response.

The second level of affect, according to Robeck and Wallace (1990), is the conceptual level and requires a greater degree of thought on the part of readers than does the associative level. At the conceptual level, readers begin to compare their needs, abilities, aspirations, characteristics, and drive to that of others as a consequence of repeated associations with verbal and non-verbal feedback. Young readers start to understand that they need to form concepts about print and that their ability to engage in and use these concepts influences how they feel about their developing awareness of their reading ability. Affect situates a reader in relation to other readers and influences readers' perception of their ability to read. Beyond Robeck and Wallace, it seems also to be the case that readers' attitude toward what is being read and toward reading influences affect (Ruddell & Unrau, 1994). If a reader's self-concept is positive, then more reading is likely to be desired. The more pleasant experiences are experienced and remembered, the more children

read. Reading more and with increasing proficiency maintains the positive self-image reflected through verbal and nonverbal feedback by others. The more children read, the more skilled they become at reading. As readers read, they construct mental representations of what is read and the aspects of reading generally and in so doing, their memory allows for more in-depth knowledge of text structures and other aspects of the process of reading (Just & Carpenter, 1987). Memory of previous positive reading experiences forms a positive memory of the experience of reading generally which can supersede or help to erase a single negative experience or intermittent negative experiences in response to particular readings. The associative and conceptual levels appear reciprocal because when readers see their ability in a positive light, their associations with the experience are pleasurable, and consequently, they want to repeat the experience, thereby advancing them to the third level of affect.

Robeck and Wallace's (1990) third and highest level of complexity to affect is self-direction. At this level, affect takes on a greater metacognitive role because readers reflect on their own needs, abilities, aspirations, characteristics, and drive and go beyond the conceptual to the next step of considering how to develop and take control of their reading experiences. This is the point at which readers come to understand the nature of reading, the satisfaction to be gained from pleasant reading experiences, and choose to engage in more and more reading. Skilled readers develop greater agility in structuring memories (Just & Carpenter, 1987) and are able to reflect on more complex concepts. Hence, positive associations increase, which in turn leads to more complex conceptualizations, which in turn leads to greater self-direction. Affect may be considered as an agent of change. And yet, although it may seem contradictory, the role of affect in memory at least in recall is to keep affect within the same bounds (positive). In other words, each aggregate positive experience assists in the development and maintenance of yet another positive affect in

response to subsequent readings, thereby expanding one's associations with, conceptualization of, and self-control in both their affective responses to and toward reading.

In sum, I suggest that the role of affect in children's response to and toward reading is complex and involves at least four functions. Affect plays an activating role to the extent that it influences children's interest in and desire to stay with a reading task, guides the cognitive goals and strategies children engage before, during and after reading, gives children an anticipatory advantage in some genres, and transforms children's autonomy. This summary is to be considered preliminary. A more thorough explanation of affect based upon responses from the children can be found in Chapter Four, Findings and Discussion.

Most educators would consider a positive affect toward reading a generally ideal goal to work toward as soon as possible after children enter school and especially if positive affect toward reading has not been enjoyed prior to the start of schooling. As children grow, their continued experiences in reading (or lack thereof) develop affect as their concept of themselves grows and changes through comparison with others, feedback from teachers and peers, and from their own affective responses to reading. Over time, positive feedback, support, and individual success can lead to persistence of effort in reading. Children who have grown in their thinking and positive emotional experiences with reading reach a level of independence and enjoy self-direction in their reading experiences. Intrinsically motivated readers can be disposed to read a wide range of topics, electing to read to fulfill themselves based on self-knowledge and their need for the satisfaction of completing their knowledge that may be gained only by engaging in the activity of reading. The role of affect thus appears to be very powerful in early reading development, and indeed may lie at the basis of success in reading.

Often we do not know much about children's affect for reading before coming to school; however, as educators we may study the role of affect in children's reading. Collecting and

analyzing the self-reports by children in grades kindergarten, two and four about their affect in response to and toward reading was a challenging and enjoyable piece of research. Because the research was new, a conversation/interview guide was developed to help to discover how children perceived aspects of their own reading, how they viewed reading at home, at school and among their peers. These were factors seen to influence reading in the past and with this study there is more precise evidence about these factors and their role in children's affective development. As well as grade level, other factors that are part of the model of children's affect in response to and toward reading include gender and level of reading proficiency. Although the literature suggests that affect is related to achievement, to general cognitive growth, to engagement in reading, to instructional processes and context, and to autonomy, the specifics of these relationships until now have remained relatively unexamined. There has been a call for richer characterization especially of young readers from ages three to eight years (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). My study is one inquiry in response to a call for research in an area of longstanding fascination for me and in an area where innovative ways to think about children's affective development in response to and toward reading can now be explored with some greater understanding.

CHAPTER TWO

AFFECT AND READING: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of my research was to discern children's affect in response to and toward reading. Because my research was motivated, in part, by evidence indicating that children were showing a negative attitude toward reading at a younger age than was previously realized, literature dealing with reluctant readers, aliterate readers, and resistant readers was included in the review. The terms, reluctant reader, aliterate reader, and resistant reader have connotations implying a disinclination to read. There are many children though, who love to read and make time to read regularly. Children who love to read have often been referred to as avid readers. They were included here to show the full range of readership. Other areas applicable to children's affect included gender, grade level, level of reading proficiency and reading instruction. There was an overwhelming lack of clarity in the psychological literature with the term affect and so an educational examination of the term was necessary as a start.

Working within the field of mathematics teaching and learning, DeCorte, Greer, & Verschaffel (1996) understood that the "affective domain suffers from a lack of clarity" (p. 506). As models of mathematics learning are now including affective components, they acknowledged that there is increasing recognition of the growing need to take affective factors into account when dealing with "intellectual functioning in general and mathematics learning in particular" (p. 502).

Schoenfeld (1985) wrote that beliefs affect behavior in terms of how one approaches a mathematical problem, which methods will be used or avoided, and persistence and time spent on the problem. He gave the examples of math anxiety and fear of success as the negative effects of beliefs on mathematics achievement (p. 154). Clearly, within the field of mathematics teaching and learning, affective components include beliefs, attitudes and emotions and each of these in turn has a stronger affective aspect than the one previous to it. Given Schoenfeld's relatively clear

usage of affect in the mathematics field, the same clarity was not evident within the field of reading. Although work in mathematics does not link the terms motivation and affect, the field of psychology did explicitly connect these terms and some of the reading literature used the terms affect and motivation interchangeably. The reading field, however, extended affect to include interests and defined affect as producing an effect; it could influence and modify (Harris & Hodges, 1981).

The most recent dictionary of literacy did not include the term affect (Harris & Hodges, 1995). However, in their earlier dictionary of reading, Harris & Hodges (1981), described affect as a feeling or emotion which could produce an effect, influence or modify reading (p.9). Affective domain, on the other hand, was listed in both dictionaries and the definition in the more recent edition had not changed from the earlier one, "the psychological field of emotional activity" (Harris & Hodges, 1995, p. 5). Other texts on reading shed more light on how the term affect has been used in the field.

A sampling of texts on the psychology of reading covering a number of years revealed the widespread nonuse of the terms affect or affective domain (Crowder & Wagner, 1992; Gibson & Levin, 1975; Huey, 1908). Huey referred to feelings as "unanalyzable" mental states (p. 163). The one notable exception among the reading psychology textbooks was by Robeck and Wallace (1990), who used the terms, motivation and affective domain interchangeably. They stated, "Motivation is learned as an affective component of all reading-related experiences. The act of reading has an emotional effect; if pleasurable, the cognitive component tends to be retained, repeated, and remembered. Affects of displeasure or punishment associated with reading, lead to avoidance and forgetting" (Preface). They delineated three levels of learning, namely, association, conceptualization and creative self-direction. They are called levels because the processes at each level are basic to more complex learning at the next level. Conceptualization, for example, requires higher thought processes than association.

At the level of association, whether or not readers read or avoid reading is based on whether or not the pleasure centers or punishment centers in the brain have been activated. If the reading situation is pleasurable, it is likely the activity will be repeated or reinforced. Repetition results in "consolidation of content and skills being practiced" (Robeck & Wallace, 1990, p. 33). If readers, cannot break the code, cannot fulfill their information needs and also experience displeasure on the part of the teacher; there is a strong possibility reading will become "linked to punishment centers in the same way that success and satisfaction connections are made to the pleasure centers" (p. 33). Learners, in order to avoid punishment, would redirect their attention to a more pleasurable activity. Affective learning is seen at level one as being rather "vague" (p. 37). Children although they may feel good are "unaware of the source of their feelings or of the effect of pleasure rewards on their learning" (p. 37). If they feel in a "down mood" they won't be aware of the events that led up to this mood.

At the level of conceptualization, the second level of learning, the young readers for example, "need to conceptualize the invariate order of letters in words, the relationship of phonemes spoken to words seen, and the syntactic ordering of words to make story books" (Robeck & Wallace, 1990, p. 35). Readers understand that particular events or actions effect how they feel. They develop affective conceptualizations that refer primarily to themselves in terms of "personal needs, goals, attributes, abilities, and motivations" (p. 36). Affective conceptualizations of the self are developed through comparison of self with others and "from the verbal and nonverbal messages received from others" (p.36). Robeck and Wallace maintained that affective conceptualizations are not easily reversible once developed. Thus, the effects of having difficulty reading or not learning to read well would seem to be relatively permanent if not overcome prior to conceptualization.

The third level of learning is called creative self-direction. At this level, there is a "fusion of motivation" and cognition due to the growth of emotional experience and cognition; knowing oneself and how incomplete one's knowledge is leads to self-motivation (p. 38). Self-motivation is the foundation for self-direction. The learner comes to understand both the structure of knowledge and the sense of satisfaction to be gained by engaging in the activity. Robeck and Wallace's (1990) view of affect as motivation is reflected in the more recent writing of Alexander and Murphy (1999) and Oatley and Nundy (1996). Robeck and Wallace treated affect separately, as part of the aesthetic experience. They wrote, "An aesthetic approach to literature enlists the contributions of both the cognitive and the affective domains. The affective potency of words is a significant variable in their being recognized during brief exposure...Conceptualization of both cognitive and emotional content, level two functioning in the model, are antecedents of the appreciative reading of literature" (p. 57). Other researchers focused on extensions to affect to include interests, attitudes, and values, whereas others focused on the interaction between affect and cognition.

Within the reading literature, affect has been called "a state which includes a reader's interests, attitudes, and values which determine goals and objectives for the reading of a passage" (Ruddell & Speaker, 1985, p. 756). Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) writing fifteen years later in the *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 3, 2000) stated "readers are decision makers whose affects as well as their language and cognition play a role in their reading practices" (p. 403-404). They noted further that "wants and intentions" make reading possible. We read not only because we can but, we want to or are motivated (p. 404). They make distinctions between affect and motivation, affect as attitude toward reading means liking to read. And affect as interest is specific to a subject or text. Motivational interest, according to Guthrie and Wigfield is more general like interest in a variety of genres. Affective beliefs would seem to be more personal, that the reader creates meaning in relation to a text based on "their own knowledge, interest, and experiences as well as

the information in the text" (p. 405). Out of the many references to affect in an earlier edition to *The Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 2, 1991), Graesser, Golding and Long (1991) identified "affective patterns" as one of the components of narrative (p. 175). Narratives entertain and part of the entertainment is to "trap" emotions and level of arousal. The plot is designed to "manipulate" affective responses and transform emotions and arousal levels showing cognition and affect to be "inextricably bound" (p. 175 - 176). Affect seemed not only to include feelings, emotions, mood, and temperament, but also attitudes, beliefs, values, interests, and motivation. Given the varied definitions of affect in the reading literature, how then has affect been accommodated within models of reading?

Robeck and Wallace's (1990) view of affect as motivation would appear to reflect a skills-based theory of reading: children must break the code to satisfy their information needs. If children break the code, reading is associated with the pleasure centers of the brain and the activity will most likely be repeated. If breaking the code is difficult and information needs cannot be met, then reading is associated with the punishment centers in the brain and it will most likely be avoided. In a bottom-up theory, meaning resides in the text and children learn to process what they are reading from part to whole. But from my standpoint, association means awareness, conceptualization is awareness with understanding, self-direction is awareness, understanding and control. Therefore, Robeck and Wallace's model can be viewed as development of social and affective cognition.

Ruddell and Speaker (1985) developed an interactive reading process model in which meaning resides in the reader whereby the reader creates meaning from the text based on prior knowledge. Affect in the interactive model is defined as "the reader's goals and expectations" (p. 751). As the reader reads, how the text is represented can change with the reader's construction of meaning. The reader's goals and expectations, which are based on values, attitudes, and interests, may change. The skilled reader is one who has greater world knowledge, language knowledge,

and decoding skills and, as a reader's knowledge matures, reading, which includes the notion of information processing, finds the reader learning to chunk information and develop automaticity. Automaticity allows more freedom to pay attention to comprehension of text. However, if the reading takes longer than the reader expects, negative affect may be formed and this may influence future reading to the point where the reader will stop reading and avoid future reading situations. Self-monitoring and evaluation through metacognition "enables the reader to alter the processing plan to meet the original goal, to change goals or to terminate the reading process" (p. 758). For Ruddell and Speaker, "the reading process is conceptualized on a developmental learning continuum without precisely defined stages" (p. 754). However, they express their lack of knowledge about how the control states of affect, cognition and metacognition develop.

While acknowledging the early history and family influence on the reader, the Ruddell and Speaker model does not focus on the specifics of home environment. The interactive model, in this case, is framed in a school environment, where the teacher is seen to control both instruction and to a great extent, conversational patterns. The evolution of this model, has seen the inclusion of the prior beliefs and knowledge of the reader as a major component in the reading process. The affective conditions include: "motivation to read, attitude toward reading and content, readers' stance, as well as their sociocultural values and beliefs" (Ruddell & Unrau, 1994, p. 999). The model is described as a socio-cognitive model and reading is seen as a "meaning-construction process," which includes the reader, the text, and the teacher. Meanings are negotiated within the classroom community (p. 999). Reading as a meaning construction includes both theories of reading as a transaction (Rosenblatt, 1978) and the influence of attitudes on reading and learning to read (Mathewson, 1994; McKenna, 1994).

The transactional theory associated with the work of Rosenblatt (1978) is a theory of reader and text engagement; there can be no reader without a text and no text without a reader.

The reader's stance toward a text may be seen along a continuum from efferent (the factual information in the text) to aesthetic (the experience of the reading). If a reader's stance is inappropriate for a text then the engagement/transaction may be less fruitful than it could have been. Furthermore, an understanding of personal and intellectual characteristics that make a person more or less engage in reading are less well understood and especially so for young children.

Two recent models of the "affective" in reading were Mathewson's Model of Attitude Influence upon Reading and Learning to Read (1994) and McKenna's Proposed Model of Reading Attitude Acquisition (1994). Mathewson's definition of attitude included "prevailing feelings about reading, action readiness for reading and evaluative beliefs about reading" (p.1135) which implies attitude is characterized by affective (feeling), conative (willingness to act) and cognitive (evaluating) factors. McKenna reviewed various models of reading attitude [e.g., Mathewson's Model (1994), Fishbein's and Ajzen's, Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior (1975), and Liska's revision of the Fishbein-Ajzen Model (1984)] and distinguished beliefs from attitudes, seeing the former as causes of reading attitude. The three factors that cause reading attitudes according to McKenna are, "(1) beliefs about the expectations of others, (2) beliefs about the outcomes of reading, and (3) individual reading experiences" (p. 34). The definition of reading attitude adopted by McKenna was that of Alexander and Filler, "a system of feelings related to reading which causes the learner to approach or avoid a reading situation" (1976, p. 1). The terms, approach and avoid, echoed the work of Robeck and Wallace (1990) which in turn echoed the idea of something pleasant or unpleasant (Frijda, 1993), and/or one's likes or dislikes (English & English, 1958).

Beyond psychology, mathematics, and reading, another discipline related to reading that had attempted to define affect was English. Although not within the field of reading per se, affect within English literature was defined as "the subjective experience of emotions and feelings,

including...feelings that have little or no cognitive content but which operate immediately as judgments, preferences and the like" (Miall, 1989, p. 61). Miall conceived affect as primary in the reading of narratives based on the belief that affect has three properties. "Affect is self-referential, cross-domain, and anticipatory" (p. 61). Emotions raised during reading "cause schemata to be reconfigured" (p. 62) or new schema to be created so that reading has the potential of transforming the reader. When what is read in the text does not fit with a reader's schema and the reader goes back to the text looking for more information, new schemata may necessarily be developed in order to come to an understanding of the story and in the process affect may also be positively or negatively changed. "Affect is cross-domain: It can transfer from schemata in one domain (such as those concerned with a story's setting) to those in another (such as the relationship between two characters)" (p. 61). Further, affective implications in the story cause a reader to construct a representation of the outcome in order to maintain comprehension. One aspect of Miall's definition of affect within the reading of narrative was founded in the seminal work of Zajonc (1980), and later confirmed in the subsequent work of Zajonc (2000), who wrote with reference to preferences which may not be attached to thoughts or have little thought connected to them. It appears that some of the literature from psychology, mathematics and psychology of reading tend to view affect as part of the process of reading. However, the literature on reading deals with affect in terms of the process of reading and affect as an outgrowth of the reading of a passage as presented by Graesser, Golding and Long (1991) and by Miall (1989).

Children come to school with emotions, attitudes and beliefs already in place. For those children who come with positive literacy experiences, it has been shown that "the literacy interactions at home appear to form an important foundation for learning to read" (Smith, 1997, p. 250). For those children who come to school with either negative, neutral, or limited literacy experiences, it has been shown they are likely to experience difficulties with learning to read and

unfulfilled expectations (Snow, Barnes, Chandler, Goodman, & Hemphill, 1991). Other terms such as reluctant, aliterate and resistant readers imply that neutral or negative reading experiences have occurred, and yet, many children have positive beliefs and attitudes toward reading. Those who read a great deal are often called avid readers.

Reluctant Readers

The most recent dictionary of literacy defined reluctant reader as "a euphemism for one who does not like to read, a reluctant reader may not have the ability or skills to read or may have the skills but, for a variety of reasons, not choose to read" (Harris & Hodges, 1995, p. 218). This definition of the reluctant reader has not changed from an earlier text on reading and related terms written by Harris and Hodges in 1981. The root of confusion about whether a reluctant reader is a skilled reader or an unskilled reader may be traced back more than a decade prior to Harris and Hodges, to the work of Chambers (1969) who saw the reluctant reader as an able reader without an inclination to read.

Walsh, Rafferty and Turner's (1992) description of reluctant readers was reminiscent of Chambers (1969). They referred to reluctant readers as "children who opt not to read even though they have acquired the necessary skills" (p. 132). Turner (1992), however, like Harris and Hodges (1981), focused on the fact that reluctance occurs in good and poor readers, "both good and poor readers are reluctant to engage in recreational and independent reading" (p. 50). Turner echoed Chambers, "many students perceive reading as only school or work-related because of how it is taught and practiced in classrooms" (p. 50). Turner used the term, aliteracy to refer to "the ability to read, but the unwillingness to do so" (p. 50).

Aliterate Readers

Aliteracy was the term used by Mikulecky (1978) to describe "the increasing numbers of capable readers who were regularly choosing not to read". Aliteracy has been used variously to

refer to those who "don't read" (a behavior) (Beers, 1996, Part 1), to those who "won't read", (unwillingness or negative attitude) (Heins, 1984), and to those who "choose not to read" (unwillingness or negative attitude) (Cramer & Castle, 1994), The words "choose not to read when other options are available or exist" are used by McKenna, Kear and Ellsworth (1995, p. 934) and by Haverty, Libersher, Libersher, Pellegrini and Queeney (1996, p. 34) to define aliterate readers.

The term aliteracy is found in many dictionaries. A current literacy dictionary defined aliteracy as a "lack of the reading habit in capable readers" (Harris & Hodges, 1995, p. 6). Although the definition for an aliterate reader seemed to have been clarified over the years, the term, reluctant readers still seems unclear at this point. Both of these terms have developed concurrently over the last twenty or so years and in many cases their meanings have overlapped, become one, then separated.

Reluctant Readers and Aliterate Readers

An article about motivating the reluctant reader by Kettel (1994) is an example of oneness in usage of the terms reluctant and aliterate to describe the same type of readers. Kettel did not directly use the term, reluctant reader, but rather used the same terminology for a reluctant reader that many others had used for aliterate readers. He wrote, "many children can read but choose not to" (p. 2). Many students have mastered the skill but do not read for their own "personal enjoyment" (p. 2).

Turner (1992) reported that reluctant readers do not read for a variety of reasons: "lack of interest, inappropriateness and scarcity of materials, lack of reading ability and past failures in reading, inappropriate instruction, conflicting values on the importance of reading, and a nonreading environment in both the home and school" (p.51). Klesius, Laframboise and Gaier (1998) drew similar conclusions, suggesting that reluctant readers are not proficient, not interested, have had negative comments made about their reading by peers, parents, and teachers, have had

to read in front of their peers, are frequently interrupted for corrections by the teacher, have suffered from a lack of success in reading, and had to read unappealing material (p. 253). Note both of these study examples show that the reluctant reader is one who has difficulty or struggles with the reading process. Just as Robeck and Wallace (1990) stated, although not disabled, the reluctant reader is not a skilled reader.

Resistant Readers

Even though the term, resistant reader has come up from time to time there was very little in the literature on this subject. On the surface, one might consider the hostile overt avoidant reader as a resistant reader. However, such an interpretation does not tell the whole story, as we shall see (Bintz, 1993; Dressman, 1997; Mackey, 1993; Margolis & McCabe, 1996).

Resistance is a term used in general psychology but perusal of various psychology of reading texts offered little (Crowder & Wagner, 1992; Gibson & Levin, 1975; Huey, 1908; Robeck & Wallace, 1990), nor was the term, resistant reader found in current dictionaries of reading or literacy (Harris & Hodges, 1981;1995). A current dictionary of psychology defined resistance as "an action against an opposing force" (Corsini, 1999, p. 834). The view of resistance presented by Dressman (1997) was unlike the view of resistance in reading presented by Robeck and Wallace (1990), that of careless and hostile overt avoiders of reading. Dressman did not define resistance per se. Rather, he described two scenarios, one in which the home and school forms of oral and written communication are different such that there is continuous misinterpretation and miscomprehension leading to frustration on the part of students and eventual avoidance of "school literacy tasks" (p. 278). The second scenario describes working class, poor students behaving in ways that keep them subordinated in the middle-class school system but theorists of the post-industrialist milieu support a new age where these behaviors will subvert the old order and create positive change. Neither of two these scenarios reflected resistance to reading. They are scenarios

of behaviors that deal with resisting control and are aligned with theories of resistance in education based on the theory that schools reproduce the ideology of the dominant culture that is upper middle-class and white.

Dressman (1997) carried out an ethnographic study of resistance in school libraries focusing on one grade three class of students in each of three schools whose teacher utilized library resources regularly. The school libraries were situated in three socio-economic areas, low, middle, and high. He found that students did not "always either resist or conform to modes of reading or practices of text use in ways that were ideologically reproductive" (p. 278). Dressman found that middle class school library provided anonymity to the students; they could find the information they needed for themselves; they were not dependent on the librarian because library skills were taught to everyone; the library was an open library system where times to visit were flexible after grade two (students could come more than once a week); and there were "trusting relations between teachers and students" (p. 302) that allowed conversations to occur that respected and accepted students' opinions and knowledge. In the lower class library, because of the perceived impoverished backgrounds of the students, teachers and librarians kept records of the children's reading levels and students could take out books only at their reading level. Fiction was the only genre acceptable to the librarian for borrowing, so some of the students would visit the library at lunchtime, when the librarian was not there, in order to look for and borrow the books they wanted. The students were not taught library skills and many found their lack of knowledge and lack of independence frustrating. Library skills were not taught in the third, the upper middle class school library. The librarian related that the children, "pick up this stuff" (p. 280), the library schedule was fixed, and the librarian knew all the students by name. In this library, Dressman found that students in this instance conformed to expectations regarding the reading of texts; they read so they could get a good job, to achieve a position in life in the future. Children obeyed the

rules of home and school because to do otherwise was to "fall from grace" (p. 287). Did students in Dressman's study resist reading? Some of the grade three children resisted their lack of independence, their inability to find what they needed for themselves and someone else's control over their reading choices.

Bintz (1993) found similar conditions occurring at the high school level. Avid readers took the time to read. They saw the twin factors of positive role models and their own interests in a variety of topics as causing them to find ways to acquire books. They saw reading as a "tool for learning" (p. 608). Passive readers, although they read fluently, described reading as school-related and teacher-directed and not particularly pleasurable. They had difficulty applying reading strategies and "monitoring their own comprehension" (p. 609). The reluctant readers are described as readers who read poorly or well, who refused or "actively avoided" reading (p. 609) and suffered continuous reading difficulty and failure. These readers were generally unmotivated and only participated in class through answering assigned questions. There appears to be some confusion with the term, reluctant reader, as used by Bintz, that is, a reader who reads well. He goes on to note that research on passive and reluctant readers indicates that many suffer from "defects and deficiencies" (p. 609) as well as passive behaviors and attitudes which may have been caused by being given material at an inappropriately high reading level. Bintz stated that there were two problems regarding the literature on reading failure: reading failure is most often viewed as a "permanent condition" (p. 610); and reading failure is often seen from a school's perspective only.

Students were found to use different reading strategies depending on the "social context as well as the nature and purpose of the reading itself" (Bintz, 1993, p. 611). Students did not expect school reading to be interesting and therefore read only what was needed to do the required schoolwork. They collected enough information to get by. Teachers perceived many of these students as passive and reluctant readers and felt that they needed to be held accountable

for their reading through testing. Yet, the reading these students did outside of school, reading which reflected their personal interests, covered a broad range of reading materials from hunting, aviation, weapons, sports, to romance and religion (p. 611). Bintz stated that he believed "students demonstrate not an explicit reluctance to read but rather an implicit resistance to reading school-assigned materials" (p. 612). Students were not given control over or choice in what they read or the order in which materials were to be read, not taught that different genres require different reading stances, nor that the method of reading they use to gather information is actually detrimental to their reading ability when applied to all reading. The resistance that these students exhibited toward reading was not a resistance to reading per se but rather a resistance to control.

Bintz (1993) referred to theories of resistance in education (Everhart, 1983; Giroux, 1983) to help explain student resistance to reading at the high school level, "Schools are not only cultural institutions but also sites of symbolic conflict where individuals produce and reproduce their social worlds through explicit and implicit oppositional behaviors and attitudes" (p. 612). Within school the actions of the students mediate between the "schools' structural determinants [the reading curriculum in this instance] and the students' intentions and aspirations" (p. 612). Both Bintz and Dressman (1997) discussed students' resistance to reading as their reading being controlled by outside forces.

Mackey (1993) described reading resistance more as resistance against the item being read in and of itself. She provided examples of readers from high school, undergraduate and doctoral levels and stated resistance can be "radically affected by context" (p. 69). Some students may resist reading books supplied on a teacher booklist rather than word-of-mouth recommendations by friends. Teachers may resist the unsolicited recommendations of students because they are not part of a recommended list and parent approved or vetted. Other kinds of resistance referred to by Mackey included a student's "unwillingness to take the author on trust", a

student providing a "stock response" to a reading, a student being so enamoured by the craft of writing s/he cannot submit to its affect (p. 69). She provides one of the four definitions of resistant reading most pertinent to this study, "A common description of resistance-reading is that it is reading against the grain of the text, noticing the constructed nature of the text, being aware of the author's assumptions and ideologies" (p. 74). Resistance is not about control coming from outside of the reader, resistance is the control of reading by a reader in response to the writing of an author. The reader does not agree with the author based on specific criteria. Does this not sound like literary criticism or critical literacy as opposed to resistance to reading because Mackey herself makes the point that we need "greater clarity about what we mean by resistance" (p. 70). Margolis and McCabe (1996), Ritchie (1992) and Snow (2000) provide three more definitions of resistance which further indicate some of the confusion over the term.

Ritchie (1992) undertook a participant-observation study in a post-secondary English class. She was interested in the fact that most of those students who opposed reading were male and so focused on the reading experience of four males in the class. Opposition to reading took various forms: not coming to class on the days that "assigned reading was discussed", coming to class without having read the assigned reading and "faking it"; acknowledging not having done the reading; "respond[ing] as though the reading were an obstacle" (p. 122). For the purposes of her study on resistance to reading, Ritchie stated that within cultural and literary theory, resistance is "a result of the inseparable relationship between knowledge and power and, more specifically, the result of the political and ideological nature of literacy" (p. 117). She found that students were aware of the tensions between the various discourses in which they lived and worked but needed to be taught that analyzing those discourses is important to making personal decisions regarding their education. It is important to their knowledge of their own values, and "to illuminate rather than mask the gendered, racial, socio-economic contexts of literacy and of subjectivity" (p. 135).

Knowledge of a discourse allows for a self-conscious liberating resistance (Ritchie, 1992). In the case described by Margolis and McCabe (1996), resistance was described as avoidance of reading and that resistance was based on lack of knowledge about how to read. They rejected the label resistant reader as inaccurate (p. 19) because it blamed the student, implying a character flaw. They provided twelve questions to guide teachers, parents and professionals in applying curiosity theory, learned helplessness/optimism theory, and behavioral theory to help develop positive change and growth in students. Margolis and McCabe are not alone in either the explicit or implicit view of reading resistance as avoidance of reading. Looking back to Wilhelm (1995a; 1995b), the students he classed as reluctant sometimes refused to read and avoided reading; and Robeck and Wallace (1990) used the term, hostile avoidant to describe those students who refused and avoided reading. In a relatively recent presentation at the Centre for Research on Literacy at the University of Alberta, Snow referred to resistant readers as "those who just don't get it even after direct instruction" (May 26, 2000). Avoidance of reading seemed the most appropriate definition of resistance for the purposes of my research. Unlike Margolis and McCabe, I did not see the term resistant reader as intimating a character flaw; indeed it implied to me that a student might find reading to be so painful, s/he cannot deal with it.

Avid Readers

A portrait of the avid reader has to some extent already been painted; Bintz (1993) informed us that avid readers at the high school level took the time to read because reading was seen as an "attractive and preferred activity." They saw the twin factors of positive role models and their own interests in a variety of topics as causing them to find ways to acquire books. They saw reading as a "tool for learning" (p. 608). Reading allowed them to participate in a community of like-minded people.

Victor Nell (1994) wrote about ludic readers or those who see pleasurable reading as a form of play or entertainment. For ludic reading to begin three pre-conditions must obtain: the reader must be a skilled reader, the reading experience is expected to be pleasurable, and the selected book must be appropriate (1994, p. 47). If any of the preconditions is not met, then the ludic reading "won't be attempted or it fails" (p. 49). If the preconditions hold, then two types of reinforcement keep the reading going, 1) physiological and 2) cognitive changes. "Reading changes the focus of attention from self to environment" (p. 49), a readers' control over reading speed, topic, when reading begins, and how long it lasts can either intensify or deaden consciousness. If the ability to read well is not present, if the expectations are not positive and/or the wrong book has been chosen, the consequences of the reading will be unpleasant and the reader will choose an alternative activity.

Writing about children's reading of popular fiction, Cullingford (1998) discussed types of readers and reader control, "I would argue that there are any number of different readers, bringing their own concerns and interests to bear, looking for the fulfillment of expectations on a number of levels. They know what to look for and know what to take. They are not passive receivers any more than they are perfect instruments of intellectual appreciation. What they have in common is a habit of reading that combines different levels of response" (p. 28) and whether a reader is detached or involved in a book depends on the reader. The reader, "combines imaging, association and criticism", and controls which one of these takes precedence in the private act of reading (p. 30).

In a report on "factors involved in the leisure reading of upper elementary school students", Shapiro and Whitney (1997) found among the 39 fourth and fifth grade competent readers in their study, 21 were considered avid readers and 18 were not (based on reported leisure time reading over a three week period), that non-avid readers were very anxious about their reading and that the

home variables of books as gifts, being taken to the library, being read to until an older age, and being encouraged to read were statistically significant.

Hall and Coles (1999) authors of the *Children's Reading Choices*, a survey of nearly 8,000 students in England ages 10, 12 and 14, replicated and extended an earlier study by Whitehead, Capey, Maddren and Wellings (1977) and found, "There is little, if any, relationship between children taking a positive view of their own reading ability and living with adults who are keen readers"; however, "there is a significant positive relationship between children's enthusiasm for reading and the amount of reading they do and living with a sibling who reads a lot and there is a significant positive relationship between the amount of reading children do, and living with a sibling who reads a lot" (p. 108). Under the category of "children's reading habits" it was noted, "there is a positive relationship between book ownership, the amount of reading children do and children's views of themselves as readers". It was further noted, "Children from more advantaged socio-economic groups report borrowing more frequently from libraries than children from less advantaged groups" and finally "children are more likely to borrow books from the public library if they own books themselves" (p. 121). This survey informs us that having sisters and brothers who read had a positive influence on the other children in the family, children who owned books saw themselves as good readers, children who were financially better off took out more books from the library than poor children, and children who owned books were more likely to take out books from the library. It would seem that socio-economic status and family structure are powerful factors in whether or not children read or become avid readers.

Gender

Because the purpose of this study was to look at children's affect in response to and toward reading at kindergarten, grades two and four, (approximate ages 5, 7 and 9), a more applicable study for review was that of the Children's Literature Research Centre, lead by Reynolds

(1996) and titled *Young People's Reading at the End of the Century*. The data included reading choices and opinions of over 8,000 students, 645 children at Key Stage 1 (ages 4 years to 7 years one month), 2,198 children at Key Stage 2 (ages 7 years two months to 11 years one month) and 5,001 children at Key Stage 3 and 4 (ages 11-14 years and 14-16 years, respectively). Although the report was not about avid readers per se, the findings indicated reading preferences and information on those who influenced their reading. For example, the results of the survey showed that "at Key Stage 1 more girls than boys are interested in information books" (p. 214). Groupings at the other key stages showed that boys "claimed to read information books 'very often', 'often' or 'sometimes' though in nearly all instances the figures for both sexes are well above 60%" (p. 215). Further findings indicated that Key Stage 1 children "often" or "very often" choose books by themselves. But many more boys at this level and in these categories also had help from a family member including mom and dad (p. 11). Girls tended to describe themselves as "enthusiastic readers" at all stages. Both males and females who said they read "lots, more than four hours [a week] and "quite a lot, three to four hours" out of school, said they do more of many other activities as well (p. 115). It is unfortunate but "the pattern of decline in the numbers of enthusiastic readers was similar for both sexes, falling from 65% of girls at KS1 to 29% at KS4, and from 49% of boys at KS1 to an alarmingly low 18% at KS4" (p. 121).

The results of *Young People's Reading at the End of the Century* study confirmed that boys appear to have a more negative attitude towards reading than girls (Davies & Brember, 1993; Kush & Watkins, 1996; McKenna, Kear & Ellsworth, 1995). Negative attitudes toward reading are said to be more focused against school reading (Bintz, 1993; Kush & Watkins, 1996; McKenna, Kear & Ellsworth, 1995), indicating that gender and children's reading instructional histories are relevant factors in the study of children's affect in response to and toward reading. Each of these factors is discussed in turn.

A study completed by Davies and Brember (1993) of 611 students in England, 312 boys and 299 girls, in years two, four and six of schooling found that male children in year two (ages 6 – 7+ years) and year four (ages 8 – 9+ years) were unhappy or very unhappy reading to the teacher at school, reading to themselves at school, and reading at home. Girls in year two and year four were happy or very happy reading in these situations. Although not significant statistically [Year 2 (1%) and Year 4 (5%) p. 310], by the time the girls reached year six (ages 10 – 11+), more girls than in any other group were very unhappy reading to themselves at school.

McKenna, Kear and Ellsworth's (1995) national study of 18,185 children in grades one to six throughout the United States indicated that the general overall trend of attitude toward reading both as a pastime and in academic situations became increasingly negative as students moved from first to sixth grade. The mean drop between grades for recreational reading was significant except between grades two and three, and for academic reading at all five grades from grades one to six (p. 945). The developmental relationship between recreational and academic reading attitude and each of the components, a) reading ability, b) gender, and c) ethnicity indicated that reading ability and gender have a significant and negative effect on attitude but that ethnicity does not play a significant role in the "negative trend in attitude development" in either academic or recreational reading (p. 952). The negative relationship between ability and gender indicates, in this case, not only that boys with decreasing levels of ability show a more negative attitude toward reading than that shown by girls, but also boys of all ability levels generally show a more negative attitude toward reading than do girls.

The three studies by Davies and Brember (1993), Kush and Watkins (1996), and McKenna, Kear and Ellsworth (1995) speculated that different gendered beliefs among children may hold the answer to why there are differences in reading attitudes. Ideas, concepts and categories of beliefs concerning teacher gender and gender socialization, classroom reading

materials and gender representation, children's reading interests as well as cultural attitudes regarding reading and gender have been discussed in the literature. Other researchers, for example, remind us that some cultures see reading as a feminine activity (Hall & Robinson, 1996; Millard, 1997; Mitchell, 1994). Some speculate that teachers themselves may unknowingly socialize their students to the belief that reading is a girls' activity (Smith, Greenlaw & Scott, 1987), whereas others suggest that negative reading attitudes may be developed because the differing interests of boys and girls are not supported in classrooms (Barrs, 1994; Beers, 1996, Part 2; Caswell & Duke, 1998; Millard, 1997; Worthy, 1996a, 1996b, 1998).

Van der Bolt and Tellegen (1996) studied gender differences in the intrinsic reading motivation and emotional reading experiences of equal numbers of boys and girls among 3006 students ages nine to seventeen. They found that girls used books for "affective gratification" or to control their moods, girls were more open to reading experiences, including unpleasant emotions, and scored higher on the "neutral" emotions of interest and curiosity (p. 337). They pointed out that the emotional coping skills of boys and girls can be different and they speculated that these differences are based on emotional socialization.

In a discussion promoting "non-narrative as a catalyst for literacy development", Caswell and Duke (1998) argued "for a view of early literacy development as a process of learning to read, write, and appreciate many textual forms" (p. 116). Most kindergarten and primary classrooms use stories for teaching children how to read. Contemporary girls generally enjoy reading fiction more so than boys and it is well known that girls generally attain higher levels of reading achievement. By leaving out informational texts or by not focusing on informational texts in the early years of schooling, both boys and girls may be missing out on an important part of their early literacy development. Both Barrs (1994) and Caswell and Duke (1998) questioned the lack of non-fiction in the curriculum in the early grades and the lack of support for interests in other genres. Given the

relative recency of Caswell and Duke's (1998) comment, it is possible that the emphasis on narrative reading materials in the curriculum may not have changed much. Reading programs now include more trade published materials, literature-based reading instruction includes many varieties of materials through the use of thematic units, and the whole language (child-centered) approach allows children choice in their reading materials. With the variety of approaches and materials used currently to teach reading, how children respond to and toward reading may be tied to their reading instruction.

Reading Instruction

McKenna, Kear and Ellsworth (1995) included reading instructional methodology in their national reading survey. Teachers included in the survey were asked whether they used a basal reading program, if so, whether it was the sole source of their reading instruction or whether they supplemented the program, or whether other instructional methods were used. The results showed little difference in the effect that total basal reliance, partial basal reliance or total lack of basal reliance had on children's recreational reading attitudes; children's positive attitudes toward reading declined no matter which methodology was in place from grades one through six.

Other researchers stated that literature-based reading instruction positively influences children's attitudes toward reading. Bottomley, Truscott, Marinak, Henk and Melnick (1999), suggested from their "affective comparison of whole language, literature-based, and basal reader literacy instruction," that "a literature-based approach to reading and writing appears to exert superior impact on intermediate-aged children's affective orientations" (p. 115). Their results confirmed that children like to read literature and that the use of literature positively impacts on their writing, but, children's perceptions of their own reading skills ("word recognition, word analysis, comprehension, and fluency" (p. 119) are not affected significantly by the use of any single reading approach. Also of import is the difference in affect found between grade levels.

Without indicating any particular instructional method, they reported that the grade fours saw their ability to read and write in a more positive light than did the grade sixes. They speculate that, either the grade fours were naïve in their beliefs or they had not been spoiled by the "negative dimensions of the school system" (p. 127). They did not explain the meaning of the term, negative dimensions. This finding confirmed the earlier work by McKenna, Kear and Ellsworth (1995) that there is a decline in children's positive reading attitudes as they progress through grades four, five, and six.

Reading instructional methods can impart a positive self-concept to children (Cohen, McDonnell, & Osborn, 1989). Still others perceive that different reading approaches instill different orientations to reading (Rasinski & DeFord, 1988). Freppon (1991) looked at how different reading instructional methods and children's developmental stage in reading impart different visions of what reading is. How one looks at oneself as a reader, what stance one takes towards reading and one's ideas of what reading is, are three different foci all of which are perceived as affecting and being affected by the instructional reading method or approach to reading being utilized by a teacher. The study by Bottomley, Truscott, Marinak, Henk, and Melnick (1999) indicated that the reading approach did not appear to affect how children saw themselves as readers but the reading approach did appear to affect their attitude toward reading.

The possible effect of teaching reading methods on reading attitudes needs confirmation (Freppon, 1991; Rasinski & DeFord, 1988; Shapiro & White, 1991). Evidence shows that there is no consistency for a preferred method for teaching reading (Dahl & Freppon, 1995; McKenna, Stratton, Grindler, & Jenkins, 1995; Stahl & Miller, 1989) and different teachers emphasize different aspects within the various reading methods (McKenna, Stratton, Grindler, & Jenkins, 1995; Stahl, McKenna & Pugnucco, 1994).

A more recent study by Stahl, Pagnucco and Suttles (1996) of "first graders' reading and writing instruction in traditional and process-oriented classrooms" found that "the pacing of instruction" not the teacher or the program accounted for students' achievement in reading (p. 131). Pacing referred to the ongoing challenge for the students to read increasingly difficult materials accurately over a specific period of time (p. 136, 140). Some three decades ago Chall (1996) had reached a similar conclusion about student interest in *Learning to Read: The Great Debate*, "Generally, it was what the teacher did with the method, the materials, and the children rather than the method itself that seemed to make the difference. More specifically, I would say that interest is highly related to pacing — how instruction is geared to that tenuous balance between ease and difficulty for the child" (p. 270).

The literature review began with an examination of the research dealing with affect and provided a definition of the term, affect. Following the definition, research literature indicating negative affective images of reading was reviewed including work on the terms, reluctant reader, aliterate reader, and resistant reader. Research on avid readers reflecting positive reading attitudes, along with literature on gender and reading instruction were discussed as factors by which children's affect might also be affected. The design of the study is outlined next.

CHAPTER THREE

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

On the basis of my analysis and synthesis of the literature, the purpose of my research was to understand children's affect in response to and toward reading, specifically, how children's articulation of their affective responses to and toward reading at kindergarten, grades two and four would inform a theoretical and applied understanding of reading. Further, did the children's articulation of their affective responses differ, and if so, how, when other factors are considered, namely: (a) gender, (b) levels of reading proficiency, and (c) grade level?

Research Methodology

The methodology includes a description of the site selection, selection of the participants, the ethical considerations, the instruments, the pilot study, and the data collection, as well as the proposed methods by which the data were analyzed qualitatively. Using an open approach, qualitative research has five basic characteristics: 1) the qualitative researcher is "interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed...how they make sense of their worlds and the experiences they have with the world" (Merriam, 1998, p. 6); 2) the researcher is the primary research instrument; 3) research involves going to the site or natural setting of the participants, (4) an inductive research strategy is used (p. 7), and (5) in order to come to an understanding of children's affect, rich description is needed of the process or experience of reading and thus the collection of data in the form of the participant's own words.

Research Setting

Research for the study proceeded in two middle class schools in a major Canadian city during April and May of 2001. The kindergarten children were housed at one location and the grade two and four students were located approximately a mile away at another school. The lower grade school acted as a feeder school for the upper levels and there were 160 students at the primary

school, the elementary school had a population of 440 students. The reason for choosing a group of children from a middle class socio-economic background was that research had shown that children coming from a low socio-economic background tended not to own as many books or read as much as children from higher socio-economic circumstances who had access to reading through ownership of reading materials. Declines in reading attitude might be more visible for this reason.

Participants

The principal of the two schools chose the three classes involved in the study. There were 21 children in the kindergarten class, 27 children in the grade two class and 23 children in the grade four class. Initially 10 children were chosen at each grade level. From a developmental perspective, it is reasonable to expect an increase in sophistication in the basic processes of reading as well as in the children's ability to conceptualize, articulate, and respond to reading. The first child to return the letters of consent at each of the three grade levels became the pilot person for that grade. The final composition of the main research group of kindergarten participants became five girls and four boys; for the grade two participants three girls and six boys; and for the grade four participants, four girls and five boys, 27 children in all. Given that the number of participants involved in the study was relatively small, the teachers were asked to choose children whom they thought showed above average, average, and below average reading ability in order to have a range of achievement levels from the teacher's perspective. Although the original composition of the groups at each level chosen by the teachers began with three children at each of the ability levels, Table 1 provides a clear picture that the final tally of ability groupings was not equal according to gender and ability.

As studies had shown that children's positive attitudes declined as they go through school regardless of ability, it was appropriate to talk to children at each of these levels of reading

Table 1

Teacher Judgment of Student Reading Ability by Gender and Grade

Grade	Ability					
	Below average		Average		Above average	
Gender	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Kindergarten	2	0	1	4	2	0
2	2	1	0	2	1	3
4	2	2	2	0	1	3

proficiency. Research had also shown that boys have a more negative attitude toward reading regardless of their ability (Davies & Brember, 1993; Kush & Watkins, 1996; McKenna Kear & Ellsworth, 1995). An important aspect of my study was to find out whether children's affect in response to and toward reading differed on the basis of gender from kindergarten through grade four. To study whether this was significant and to prevent unequal representation of either gender, equal numbers of each, where possible, were included in the study. Further, the reasons for choosing these grade levels was based on the work of earlier researchers and are summarized as follows: First, a lack of information on the reading ability of kindergarten children and their affective response to and toward reading. Among the studies noted under the section, reading instruction, only two studies mentioned children at the kindergarten level. Dahl and Freepon (1995) found persistence and positive self-concept were the result of being taught to read through whole language and Stahl and Miller (1989) noted that a whole language classroom presented a more

effective orientation to reading at the kindergarten level than at grade one. Second, a need to confirm whether negative reading affect emerges some time within the second two years of schooling (Chapman & Tunmer, 1995) and third, whether or not children's affect in response to and toward reading changed as children progressed through school (Davies & Brember, 1993; Kush & Watkins, 1996; McKenna, Kear & Ellsworth, 1995).

To ensure the anonymity of the children, pseudonyms were used for all participants, thus, protecting participant identification. I gave them names based on their grade level. For example, all of the kindergarteners were given names beginning with the letter K, the twos with T and the fours with F. Any time a child was cited within the text, a number representing the child, a letter representing their gender, a number representing the question in the CARP and the date that the child was interviewed, follows the quote in brackets. The child's pseudonym is also included in the brackets if not mentioned in the text. A complete list of the children and the matching bracketed information can be found in Appendix A.

Ethical Considerations

With approval from the Department of Elementary Education University of Alberta Research Ethics Review Committee and the participating school board, an explanatory letter with consent forms attached for both parent and child was sent home to parents of the participating school where the pilot and final data collection occurred. The letter described the purpose and nature of the research, and where and how the researcher was to be contacted for further information. The teachers who participated also signed letters of consent (see Appendix B). The participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time. All data collection was conducted with the participants' consent, treated confidentially, and kept secure.

Instruments

Cresswell (1994) wrote that the primary instrument for data collection and analysis in qualitative research is the researcher. That being the case, I had to keep in mind my own biases realizing, "any gaze is always filtered through the lenses of language, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity. There are no objective observations, only observations socially situated in the worlds of the observer and the observed" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 12). In other words, my dissertation represents my "image, understanding and interpretation" of the children's perceptions in response to and toward reading affect (Denzin & Lincoln, p. 3). I was the one who heard their responses, listened to the tone of their voices, and watched their faces as they spoke about how they constructed meaning about reading affect in terms of themselves, home, school, and their peers. Through these processes, I attempted to construct an understanding of their affect in response to and toward reading.

In seeking to describe and interpret children's affect I initially interviewed the children in their school using a conversation/interview guide, the Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading Profile (CARP) and at a later date administered a test of reading proficiency, the Test of Early Reading Ability-2 (TERA-2) (Reid, Hresko & Hammill, 1989). The latter involved a series of questions using pictures, letters, words, and paragraphs as a standardized measure of their reading proficiency.

The TERA-2 (Reid, Hresko & Hammill, 1989) measures children's ability to read including their knowledge of the alphabet and their understanding of print concepts. The test measures early reading from the ages of three through nine years 11 months. As the test was standardized, it was taken to be valid and reliable having met the standards for testing both by the American Psychological Association and the American Educational Research Association.

The conversation/interview format was judged as appropriate for my study for three reasons: 1). Gopnik and Graf (1988) confirmed that children's ability to identify correctly the sources of their beliefs develops between the ages of three and five years and by the age of five children are able to remember the source of their beliefs. Hence, I expected to obtain informative responses from the children at the kindergarten level even though they were quite young. 2); the interview format had been used for many years as a means of understanding children's concepts of reading and attitudes toward reading; and 3). Izard (2000) stated, "affective states or feelings cannot be measured objectively but only through subjective self-report" (p. 88). The interview acted as a guide for the participants to self-report their affect. The information on the interview methodology implies that the researcher was there mainly for what she could "get out of the children", but I truly believed that one of the strengths of this qualitative inquiry was that not only was it an opportunity for me to learn about the children's affect but also that the interview questions would provoke thoughts about reading that may not have occurred to the children. The interview did become in more than one instance a clarification, making the unknown visible to more than the researcher.

Part of the research for this study involved creating an interview protocol that could be used effectively with young students. Items designed to identify children's affect in response to and toward reading were generated from the research literature on affect, self-perception, reading attitude, children's beliefs, and from talking to children, teachers, and fellow graduate students. Questions about affect included questions about feelings, attitudes, and beliefs about reading. For instance, Mathewson's (1994) model (i.e., Model of Attitude Influence upon Reading and Learning to Read) included children's "prevailing feelings about reading" (p. 1135), therefore questions such as the following were included, (Q. 6 under Self-perception) Does reading make you feel good? Does it depend on what you read? To complement the work of Mathewson, McKenna's (1994)

model (i.e., Proposed Model of Reading Attitude Acquisition) was used. McKenna's model showed beliefs as causing attitudes. The three factors he saw as causing reading attitudes included beliefs about the expectation of others, the outcomes of reading, and individual reading experiences. To build upon McKenna's work, the following interview questions were asked: (Q. 19 under Home) Is knowing how to read important in your family? Why? And (Q.30 under Significant others) Does anybody ever tease you about your reading? How come? (Q. 1) Tell me, what do you like to read? And (Q. 2 under Self-perception), What's your favourite book to read? The following questions were asked as part of the structured interview in accord with the work of Chapman and Tunmer (1995) on reading self-perception which dealt with perceived competence, perceived difficulty and attitude toward reading: (Q. 10 under Self-perception) Are you a pretty good reader? How do you know? (Q. 11) What do you do when you come to a word you don't know? (Q. 8 under Self-perception) Why do you read?

The CARP (see Appendix C), as previously noted, was piloted with individual children in each of the grade levels designated in order to establish validity and reliability prior to the final data collection process. Time was given to establish a relationship between the researcher and each participant before administration of the CARP proceeded. Participants were asked to bring to the interview their favorite item to read but in many cases the children brought a book from the classroom. The following children, however, did bring books from home to share with me, Kindergarten/Kristy, Grade Two/Teresa, Titus, Tor, Tripp, Tully and Tyler; Grade Four/ Faith, Felix, Ferdinand, Foster, and Freya. Twelve children brought books from home. This action indicated to researcher that there was a relatively strong level of trust in her relationship with the children. Discussion of the text, in any case, acted as a meeting point for both the children and me.

Pilot Study

Development of the CARP was carried out with individual students from various schools to bring it to its present state. While under formation, the CARP was administered to five children, to a pre-schooler, two kindergarten children, a second grader and a fourth grader. The CARP began as a 50-question questionnaire that developed into a four-part interview with approximately 25 questions to each session and then, was reduced to a single interview consisting of 33 questions in all. These questions were divided into four categories, namely, self-perception, home, school, and significant others or peers with the final question, "What is reading?" analyzed separately. When the CARP had expanded to four interviews it was pre-piloted at the kindergarten level and the researcher found that some children were not able to sustain interest in the subject matter after two sessions. This observation led the researcher to decide on a single interview format for the pilot study. At least ten percent of the total number of participants at the participating school were involved in further piloting of the CARP. The purpose of the pilot study was to determine the length of time the administration of the CARP would take and the usefulness of the questions. One student was interviewed at each of the grade levels concerned for approximately 30 minutes, using the Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading Profile, the (CARP) as a conversation guide. The responses by the children indicated that the categories chosen for the CARP were adequate and final data collection proceeded. The Test of Early Reading Ability (TERA-2) was administered to the children in a separate time period.

Data Collection

During the months of April and May of 2001, I spoke with 27 children in two schools, nine children from each of kindergarten, grade two and grade four. We met in a small room across from the gym or in the nurse's office. It was relatively quiet. I met with each of the children twice, first for the audio taped guided interview and later for the TERA-2 (Reid, Hresko & Hammill, 1989).

Data Analysis

The TERA-2 (Reid, Hresko & Hammill, 1989) was scored according to specifications in the manual. Raw scores were determined and used in the analyses of reading proficiency as being below average, average, and above average reading levels. Evidence of differences in responses was sought among the children within each grouping.

Audiotapes of the children's responses about their affect in response to and toward reading (CARP) were individually transcribed. The students' answers were analyzed systematically question-by-question in order to identify some qualitative distinctions for affect. Data analysis and interpretation was ongoing throughout the research period, with transcriptions, interview notes and researcher observations read many times in order to discover and confirm common categories present in the data and possible reoccurring patterns. The TERA-2 was administered to the children in a separate time period.

The children's responses were analyzed using qualitative cross-case displays by comparing and contrasting the variables (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Exemplary illustrations were drawn from children's responses to provide texture, breadth and depth to the many complex dimensions of children's affect in response to and toward reading. A preliminary analysis of the transcription of the last pilot participant, a five-year old, male, kindergartener, indicated that from the four areas of questions based on research (self-perception, home, school, and significant others/peers) 17 possible categories or topics were found in the transcript (family, subject, location, learning to read, time, affect, ability, teacher, friends, access, ownership, school, general reading, computer, boys, girls, and teasing). The data were compiled into a table included as Appendix D. These categories were compared with the transcript of the next participant. The case display helps to reduce the amount of data collected in the conversation in order to create a picture of the phenomenon of a child's affective response to a particular reading and toward reading generally.

Students' responses to the CARP were coded to reflect consistent categories in the responses. To increase clarity in reading, references made to questions in the CARP have been placed in brackets throughout the dissertation.

"The qualitative analysis involved three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10) all of which occurred as research proceeded. "Data reduction refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data that appear in written-up field notes or transcriptions" (p. 10). Data display is "an organized, compressed assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action" (p. 11). Conclusion drawing/verification unfolded from the beginning of the data collection as I started to figure out what things meant. Miles and Huberman present tactics for generating meaning and for testing and confirming the findings. These tactics were implemented in the research.

Miles and Huberman (1994) present a number of issues for assessing the quality of the research, the trustworthiness and authenticity of the results in a naturalistic setting, and I followed their guidelines as part of my study. Using the tactics for generating meaning, the tactics for testing and confirming findings, as well as the guidelines for assessing trustworthiness and authenticity, I applied data reduction, and data display to enable me to draw and verify conclusions about children's affect in response to and toward reading.

1. Initially the recorded interviews were transcribed and read.
2. The next stage of analysis was to arrange the transcripts according to grade and read them again.
3. The third stage was to read the transcripts again and arrange the four categories of the profile sequentially under *self-perception*, *home*, *school*, and *significant*

others. I critically analyzed each child's response in order to understand how self-perception works with affect, then moved to home, school, and significant others.

4. The fourth stage saw the transcripts grouped and read again according to gender.
5. The fifth stage was to group the transcripts according to the results of the Test of Early Reading Ability-2 (TERA-2) by grade and compare the results according to teacher judgment of the children's reading proficiency as below average, average and above average, as well as to reread the transcripts for the children's own judgments of their reading proficiency.

Analysis issues included the following:

1. The ambiguity of the term "how long" in question five since two children in kindergarten did not understand the term.
2. One of the probes in question 29, asking the children if they saw more males than females reading or if they saw more females reading, needs reconsideration because at any time the classroom composition could consist of more of one gender than the other. Indeed, the teacher of the kindergarten class explained that although the class had started with more boys than girls at the beginning of the school year, the year was ending with eight boys and thirteen girls in the class. The grade two class had 13 boys and 14 girls, and the grade four class had 10 boys and 13 girls. There would generally have been more girls than boys in the classes.
3. The original categories of self-perception, home, school, and significant others, including the question, what is reading, based on extant research (Alexander & Filler, 1976; Chapman & Tunmer, 1995; Greaney & Hegarty, 1987; Guthrie & Greaney, 1991; McKenna, Kear & Ellsworth, 1995; Shapiro & Whitney, 1997)

proved to be effective. All of the children with the exception of one kindergarten student answered questions applicable to all areas of the study. After their responses were reflected upon and the researcher's interpretation of those responses developed, salient themes were drawn with reference to the whole group of responses from the children.

Reliability and Validity

The interview/conversation guide was systematically designed and built on the work of other researchers to obtain information from the children regarding their affect in response to and toward reading. With approximately three years experience transcribing children's oral reading efforts and self-reports, I transcribed the 27 children's responses. I also kept observational notes that were used for further analysis. The triangulation of the participants' responses was ongoing throughout the data analysis as I noted when a child responded in a particular manner to a question in one section of the interview and in another manner elsewhere; I noted when the children responded in a like manner and when they differed in response to a particular question as a group as well, and I noted teacher responses and kept track of my own observations, all of which were used in the analysis of the data.

I reanalyzed the content of the responses each time they were regrouped under a particular category. Many of the responses were referred to as exemplars to illustrate particular patterns and themes that were emerging from the data. Subsequently, my supervisor, knowledgeable of the categories emerging, randomly pulled 25% and reexamined those examples performing an inter-rater reliability check. For example, when the three girls in kindergarten reported that the teacher did not ask them questions and there were children in grade two and four who also talked about being questioned, I documented my findings and my supervisor reviewed these. Any querying was resolved through discussion and at times re-listening to the transcripts to

hear the phrasing intonation of the child's voice. Final inter-rater reliability checks exceeded 88 percent using a match-mismatch procedure.

Limitations

The study was limited by the fact that all of the children were from middle class backgrounds attending middle class schools. These children's responses are "self-reports" and are therefore their "perceptions" of themselves, home, school and peers in terms of their reading affect in response to and towards reading. A further limitation may have been due to the researcher. As noted under the section, *Instruments*, my interactions with the children may have shaped the responses in unplanned and unknown ways. One issue of which I was very conscious while talking to the children was that I wanted them to realize there were no right answers. I wanted their perceptions, their ideas, not their friends' or teachers' ideas. So everything about me, how I presented myself physically and emotionally in speech, tone and look would have indicated to the children that my purpose was in solely and sincerely learning about "their" feelings about reading wherever it took place. I tried to listen well and to make the students comfortable as they talked with me (Arizpe & Styles, 2003).

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A careful review of the children's responses to the interview questions from the Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading Profile (CARP) brought to light five themes. The themes spanned the whole of the CARP as can be readily seen by the question numbers enclosed in square brackets throughout each theme and the responses cited from the children. The five themes are:

- Positive affect plays a dynamic role in reading development.
- Home support is fundamental to positive association and negotiation.
- Children are vulnerable to classroom situations and teacher control.
- Peer perceptions are not neutral, and
- Pleasure is a function of reading.

Further analysis of the responses in light of the other aspects of the study, gender, and reading proficiency by grade led to an expansion of these themes to include positive parental support, boredom, and ways to improve reading comprehension. The themes are examined and illustrated throughout Chapter Four against the framework of the theory of affect with its levels of association, conceptualization and self-direction. The focus is on reading as a social event and the role of text, as well as the role of affect in reading. Issues raised in the literature review in Chapter Two concerning instruction, reluctant readers, alliterate readers, resistant readers, and avid readers are addressed as they occurred in the children's responses. The children described the sources of their disposition toward reading. They articulated, in their middle class milieu, that they seek positive affect and feel supported by positive affect. Home was seen as the locus of positive support, the children articulated the focus of school as also being at the conceptual level of affect

but verbal and non-verbal support was generally either neutral, or negative. When children focused on school reading they spoke of evaluation, performance, and competition. Children come to school often associating reading with pleasure, once in school students perceive they are measured one against the other. Learning to read according to the children is difficult enough without being compared to others. The children implied that there were differences in their perceptions of reading depending on gender, that level of reading proficiency was negatively associated with public performance, and that some reading materials gave them pleasure and others did not. Finally, they described a resiliency towards personal reading to such a degree that it was notable that as the grade levels increased positive affect for school reading decreased. These points are elaborated in the themes that follow.

Positive Affect Plays a Dynamic Role in Reading Development

In general, when the children read they saw themselves in a positive light as they sought and provided pleasure. The children's positive affect toward the reading event and the books they owned and read at home, made it possible for them to maintain access to and control over their reading material. Ready access to and control of their own books made it possible for them to engage in reading and remain engaged as they persevered in gaining their independence and autonomy in reading. That the children saw themselves as seeking and providing pleasure through reading is supported in general by two factors, one is that more than half of them (19) chose reading as an enjoyable activity. A second factor is that they have all repeated the reading experience many times. Their actions indicated that affect was both causal (Izard, 2000) and a form of response (Oatley & Nundy, 1996).

Reading as a Social Event

Viewing reading using a socio-cognitive model, motivation, attitude, content, stance, socio-cultural values, and beliefs must all be taken into account when dealing with affect (Ruddell &

Unrau, 1994, p. 999). The children, in the process of beginning to read, described perseverance and persistence in their efforts. Not only did they accept opportunities to read, for example mom or dad might read to them at night and they got to share in the reading, but, they sought out opportunities for involvement by asking others, grandparents, aunts, and siblings to read to them. All of the children saw themselves as good readers, and only a few (Kayla, Kennedy, Kojo, and Tully) could not articulate how to get better. Tully had responded, "That's a hard question, I have no idea" [17, M, 10, 05/10/01]. Seven kindergarteners, seven grade twos and six of the grade fours still asked to be read to [16].

As for providing pleasure, Kieran and Kojo noted they wanted to learn to read to "make people happy" [05, M, 08, 05/09/01; 08, M, 08, 05/18/01], while a third, Kennedy, wanted to read to his baby brother before he went to bed [03, M, 08, 05/08/01], Tripp in grade two and Ferdinand in grade four both admitted to enjoying reading to "the baby" [15, M, 12, 05/08/01, 23, M, 12, 05/15/01]. Kieran read to his little sister. She was two years old and he had been reading books to her since she was about one. In each case, the boys were in control or wanted to be in control of the reading situation. The baby, either way, was not evaluating the older sibling and so the baby's initial associations as well as the older sibling's associations with reading were likely to have been positive.

The purpose and value of reading for some of the children was both intrinsic and extrinsic. Kristy, for instance, wanted to be asked questions so she could show she knew the right answers [25]. Kora wanted the teacher to know what she was reading about [25]. Tulsa wanted to read well to get good grades, Thomasina wanted to be able to read correctly in front of the teacher [19] and in grade four it was the girls who indicated the need for recognition for getting the right answer, Faith [25], Fania [25], and Freya [25]. Fania did not want to be laughed at by her peers [12], whereas Faith and Freya saw the questioning as a positive challenge. The concept of self as expressed

here reflects the second level of affect, conceptualization. Children understood that particular events or actions affected how they felt. They developed affective conceptualizations that referred primarily to themselves in terms of "personal needs, goals, attributes, abilities, and motivations" (Robeck & Wallace, 1990, p. 36). They compared themselves "from verbal and nonverbal messages from others" (p. 36). The children's responses are an indication that significant others help to create reading affect and confirm that affect plays a role in reading as a social event whether reading takes place at home or in school (Robeck & Wallace, 1990; Snow, Corno, & Jackson III, 1996). Here the data support Robeck and Wallace. For instance, Thomasina had been told that she did not read that well in front of the teacher and so she wanted to do so. Tulsa's uncle had to spend two years in grade two and she did not want to have to do that so marks were very important to her. Fania seemed to live with reading anxiety in school. Not only did she not want to be laughed at by her peers if she stumbled over a word [12], but she did not want to be seen as not getting the right answer in school. She stated, "That's why I like books and so if she asks me a question I can get it right on time" [20, F, 25. 05/10/01].

Many of the kindergarten children have learned the rudiments of reading, yet Kimberly knew that it was the end of kindergarten and she did not know how to read, "But now I'm five, I have to read books but except I can't" [04, F, 05, 05/09/01]! She boosted her morale by stating, "When I'm six then I'll know how to read" [04, F, 01, 05/09/01]. She has constructed a perception that allowed for the continued possibility of learning to read. On the one hand she reproached herself for not knowing how to read, yet on the other hand her intention to learn was still active. Kimberly had been read to prior to school but had not yet been allowed to participate in reading at home. Her parents controlled the reading act. Her role within the reading act was to listen. She has not given up though. She wants to learn. She maintains a positive affect toward reading and in school associates reading with pleasure as she loves to be called upon to sit and read a story to the other

children. I have noted that Kimberly relies on her memory of stories heard and reads the pictures, not the words.

The words "pretty hard" [Thomasina, 12, F, 13, 05/08/01], "HARD" [Tor, 14, M, 13, 05/08/01], and "really frustrating" [Tripp, 15, M, 13, 05/09/01] are powerful words used to describe learning how to read by Tanner, Thomasina, and Tripp respectively. Their choice of descriptors helped to validate the difficulties that some children experience. The children attributed their success in learning to read to effort and it seems their desire to read was intentional. Teresa stated that she was "awesome" even though she did not perceive the teacher as being interested in her reading [11, F, 10, 05/07/01]. She was reading two books at the same time, her dad read to her regularly and her mom asked her questions about what she read. The theory of affect as described by Robeck and Wallace (1990) does not, based on the results of my study, adequately explain the notion of negative affect. They claim that if children cannot break the code, cannot fulfill their information needs, and if they experience displeasure on the part of the teacher, then there is a strong possibility that the children will avoid reading. Robeck and Wallace (1990) see reading in these instances as a form of punishment (p. 22).

Furthermore, they go on to say that at the second level of affective conceptualization, where the children start comparing themselves to others, negative reading affect is basically permanent. I have found instead that if the teacher does not provide positive support or gives mixed messages to children about their reading and performance, the children turn elsewhere for positive support. The children turned to home because they saw that their families valued reading. Based on their experiences at home, the children themselves came to value reading (Athey & Holmes, 1969). Finlay stated somewhat reflectively, "It appears to be pretty important for my mom who has to study a lot of the times and my brother I think is going to want to read a lot too, I just know he just really likes listening to my dad read his books so, I think he will really like to read his

own books sometime" [24, M, 19, 05/15/01]. If, in cases where there seemed to be minimal support because a parent was too busy to read with the children, then, the children tried to motivate themselves. As Kelly noted her parents will read to her, "When they are not busy and when I'm not reading to myself" [02, F, 16, 05/01/01]. Her emotion thus centered on herself as she expressed her pride in her ability. Robeck and Wallace's (1990) explanation of negative affect does not hold for the children in my study. Perhaps, negative affect in circumstances where the children have many negative messages from home, peers, and school plays out as Robeck and Wallace outline. For the younger children in my study where reading was valued at home and self-perception was positive, the negative messages from the teachers were not sufficient to turn the children away from reading. The children's personal rating responses confirmed not only did they think they were reading well, many of them had their beliefs confirmed either by the teacher, or a parent, or a sibling.

But one-third of the kindergarten children, one-third of the grade two children and almost two-thirds of the grade four children, which is 40% across the grades, stated that the teacher did not say anything to them about their reading ability. If, as Robeck and Wallace (1990) stated, "displeasure on the part of the teacher" would tend to link reading to the "punishment centers" (p.33) in the brain just as success and satisfaction are connected to "the pleasure generating centers" (p.33) and therefore skills and content are remembered, where does perceived lack of interest on the part of the teacher fit in the theory of affect? Is the lack of interest perceived in a positive or negative light by the children? Athey and Holmes (1969) found in their study of junior high school students that good readers expected their teachers to be interested in them. Unfortunately, at kindergarten and grade two the children expressed disappointment in the lack of interest by the teacher in their reading. The mere fact that they mentioned it is evidence that it bothered them. At grade four it seemed as though it might even be odd for the teacher to show an

interest, as Finlay responded "My teacher has never really said anything about that" [24, M, 10, 05/15/01]. Looking at the numbers alone, the proportion of disappointment could be said to have doubled from kindergarten (3) to grade four (5).

Later in our conversations, the grade twos either implied or stated that they did not want to be asked questions by the teacher about their reading. By grade two, six of the nine children preferred no questions at all, although at grade four Faith and Freya saw the questioning as a challenge [25]. It appears that the grade twos viewed questions by the teacher as a form of punishment to be avoided. The grade fours expressed a sense of indifference because the teacher could hear them talking in literature circles [In literature circles, children were put into groups according to the novel they had chosen from the teacher's list. Each child in each group took on responsibility for certain tasks as the book was read. For example, the discussion director created and asked a requisite number (i.e., five) questions concerning the chapter under discussion, other tasks included, the word finder who chose interesting words, the artful artist drew a picture, the travel tracer wrote about where the characters had been in the chapter and what happened at each location.] The situation the children described raised the question, are we now on the path where reading is equated with evaluative questioning? Is this the thin edge of aliteracy? Aliteracy, as noted in the Review of the Literature describes those who know how to read but regularly choose not to. The term has in the past been aligned with another term, Reluctant Reader, a struggling reader and one who perceives reading as work and school related because of the way it is practiced in school and they are unwilling partners in its practice. The way reading is taught in school seems to be taking the enjoyment out of reading and here it is starting to be an activity to be avoided rather than pursued.

Role of Text

Reading particular kinds of books indicated not only emerging ability for the children, but maturity in reading taste. Kelly described, at one time, reading a whole page of a chapter book which her mother checked for her to make sure she got all the words right. She associated reading with pleasure, saw herself as a reader, and had figured out how to get better. Learning to read takes time and effort according to Kelly. She practiced reading, "like a pattern" [02, F, 13, 05/04/01]. She read to get the words right and to learn more words so that when she saw them in another book she would recognize them [02, F, 03, 05/04/01]. Kelly is a good example of a child who is so passionate and self-directed (the third level of affect) in learning to read that she brings her own books to school, even though most other children do not. Ten children described being afraid of losing their favorite book at school.

Teresa and Thomasina would not read "baby" books, and Foster stated that his least favorites were "Those easy books like those picture books. They are not quite my age" [25, M, 02, 05/16/01]. All three prefer to read chapter books. Their learning is self-directed; each child in this case is his or her own agent projecting the reading of picture books or baby books as beneath their ability and maturity.

The children need to comprehend text if they are to achieve pleasure [09]. For the majority of the children (23), understanding the story was seen as more important than getting the words right. All of the children, again with few exceptions, (Kennedy, Kora, Tanner and Frederica) kept their favourite books in their bedroom for ease of access and to protect their ownership rights. Reading also appeared to have some intrinsic value as more than half of the children (19), were likely to reread or continue to read after they had finished a book. The role of positive affect in terms of text brought the children back to reading again.

All 27 children had favorite reading material. It was not necessarily a single title, but also included a whole series, for example "Animorphs" [Tripp, 15, M, 02, 05/03/01] or it could be specific to a particular author's style as Faith noted, "Sometimes I'll go to the same author and read another one of the books" [19, F, 07, 05/04/01].

The children reread for a variety of reasons. Aside from the fact that a book might hold their interest, provide excitement, enjoyment, laughter, help them gain understanding or allow them escape, if you were Kelly, "That's what I like to do mostly [reread] because then I can get to learn those words and when I see them in other books I'll know what they are" [02, F, 03, 05/04/01]. Reading more and with increasing proficiency fostered their positive self-image and the image was confirmed through verbal and non-verbal feedback from others. The more the children read, the more skilled they became at reading. According to Just and Carpenter (1987), they construct mental representations of what is read and the aspects of reading generally and in so doing, their memory allows for more in-depth knowledge of text structures and other aspects of the process of reading become more sophisticated. But, for some children rereading filled in time and relieved boredom [Felipe, 21, M, 04, 05/11/01; Ferdinand, 23, M, 03, 05/15/01].

The children's perceptions of what they liked to read [01] were not substantially different whether they were in kindergarten, grade two or grade four in the sense that a wide variety of texts both narrative (fantasy, mystery, adventure/action, fairytales, science fiction) and expository (aliens, nature, soccer, dinosaurs, riddles, biography, religion) were mentioned, as well as poetry and novels, picture books, series, chapter books, fiction and information books, comic books, joke books and magazines (grade 4) and various individual titles and authors. The children found these particular materials pleasurable to read because the content itself provided the pleasure. The children's associations with, conceptions of, and self-direction in reading can all be said to have been reciprocal and positive.

The largest number of picture book titles was noted by the Kindergarteners. They were more apt to read picture books because their word recognition and analysis skills are limited. The largest number of titles that were part of a series came from seven children in grade two. The grade two participants also had the highest number of references to chapter books (6). The grade four participants noted the largest number of types of text from the list mentioned. What the children reported they were reading may be interpreted as an indication of positive affect because it represented what they liked to read. They reported what had provided them with positive experiences. The children also reported what they did not like to read: Some kept reading because "it's hard to find a good book" [Felipe, 21, M, 02, 05/11/01]; others would not read something they did not like [Felix, 22, M, 02, 05/11/01]; others still allowed that the book just might have some merit if they could stick it out till the end [Tanner, 10, M, 21, 05/07/01; Finlay 24, M, 03, 05/15/01]; others got frustrated when they could not find the book they were looking for [Kristy, 09, F, 02, 05/23/01; Thomasina,12, F, 21, 05/08/01].

The children's reports indicated that reading had a profound affect for them. They initially expected a book to be pleasurable. It then appears that they may have directed themselves to reserve their final judgment until they were sure they liked it. For some, they were then committed to finish the book and did not make up their minds completely until they were finished. Others stopped reading once they had made a decision that it was not satisfying their expectations. Frustration set in when expectations were not fulfilled, they wanted the vocabulary and the illustrations and the character development to be good and they could not find the material to fill their needs or the material itself did not meet their expectations. The children appear to be describing themselves as avid readers (Nell, 1988), or maybe even the readers they would like to be.

Role of Affect

Children can be good at reading but not like it. When I interviewed Knute he suddenly stated, "Don't mostly like reading I like to go out and play" [06, M, 19, 05/11/01]. With two exceptions, this little boy had responded in a positive manner to all my questions until I asked what he liked about mom and dad reading to him because he does ask them to read. He gritted his teeth, held his arms straight down at his sides and stated in a hard voice, "What I like about my books is that I like to read them" [06, M, 16, 05/11/01]! He had the highest reading achievement score among the kindergarteners in the study. Despite his high score, he described a miscue he had made when reading to me as "I failed one" [06, M, 11, 05/11/01]. Perhaps learning to read for Knute had not been enjoyable.

In theory, at the associative level, (the first level of affect) the role of affect is to allow children to become aware of pleasure or displeasure and it is the pleasure felt that causes them to return to the activity. For Knute to have learned to read, many of his previous experiences had to have been positive. Reading initially, it seems, is an activity meant to be associated with pleasure because it is an activity that is repeated over and over again but, only so when it is done out of choice and for pleasure. An activity is repeated when we gain pleasure from it. If Knute did not feel some intrinsic pleasure from reading, then there had to be an external or extrinsic reason. I speculate there were two reasons why he may have tolerated learning to read. One reason was that he had a shelf full of books at home that he wanted to read. When asked if he would like to be able to read better he had responded, "I want to read 'all' the books on my shelf" [06, M, 10, 05/11/01]. He knew how to read some of them. The second reason involved his brother. He is the oldest of three children. The youngest is a baby boy. When asked if he sometimes read to his brother and sister, he responded, "I always read to [baby's name] to feel better" [06, M, 12, 05/11/01]. Apparently the baby would stop crying when he read or sang to him. I further speculate that when he read to

his baby brother he was in control of the reading act. The pleasure was essentially intrinsic not extrinsic. In any case, according to the theory because reading is rewarding it is repeated. But somehow the theory seems to be incomplete. Knute was indicating through his behavior, a mature behavior I might add, a situation where one delays the reward. He was not avoiding reading even though aspects of the activity did not provide him with immediate pleasure.

Perceptions of reading affect can and do change. Although some larger studies have shown positive reading affect in schools slowly turning to negative affect over the period of the elementary years (Davies & Brember, 1993; Kush & Watkins, 1996; McKenna, Kear, & Ellsworth, 1995), the children in my study continued to feel positive toward reading, though for many the pleasure of reading in school seemed to narrow with time. The youngest group indicated a positive disposition towards reading in general. As Athey and Holmes (1969) noted the initial disposition toward reading was probably gained from the unvoiced beliefs and actions of those around them. Kieran's reference specifically to the "excitement" of reading a book [05, M, 06, 05/09/01] and Kennedy's idea of ability, "Makes me feel good like I'm doing good at reading" [03, M, 06, 05/08/01] are indications that ability and content have already begun to be important in the children's desire to stay with the task of reading even at the kindergarten level. By grade two, all nine children reported being positive toward reading but reading affect now appeared to depend on what it was they read. Titus brought up the quality of a book and also the nature of his own personal connection with it; it need not just be a factor of the book itself, "if it gets to be awfully boring and my mom keeps saying 'keep reading', I get bored with it because it's a boring book" [13, M, 06, 05/08/01]. Generally there was a sense that reading was no longer an activity that children naturally gravitated toward. Tor for example explained, "Well it makes me feel nice at times and at times I don't want to read" [12, M, 06, 05/08/01]. Tripp loved Animorphs, Thomasina used reading to help her with her writing. Tulsa focused on oral reading and would read only books at her reading level.

Tanner spoke about responding emotionally to books. So on the one hand we have the grade two children showing a development in their ability to react and respond to books. On the other hand reading was now viewed as "something to be doing" [Titus, 13, M, 08, 05/08/01], as a "subject" [Tripp, 15, M, 08, 05/09/01], as a "skill" [Tulsa, 16, F, 08, 05/09/01] and as a way to relieve boredom [Teresa, 11, F, 08, 05/07/01; Tyler, 18, M, 08, 05/10/01].

Does positive affect continue to depend on perceived ability? It seems the children saw ability as an accompaniment or an adjunct to reading. Tulsa's response pointed to her perceived ability and her good feeling and pleasure included oral reading, "Really good when you have, like when you read with expression and you know the book and you know how to read it and it's exciting and at your level" [16, F, 06, 05/09/01]. Reading with expression implied oral reading. Many children are taught a manageable way of finding a book that is near their instructional level through using their hands as an evaluative tool. Opening to a page somewhere in a chosen book, the children read aloud to themselves with one of their hands curled in a fist. When they miscue on a word as they read, they uncurl a finger; if a child has five fingers in the air before reading to the bottom of the page, the book will likely cause some frustration for independent reading. Tulsa's response was a school response. When asked how she would rate her reading she responded, "Well I would say I was a middle reader. Like I'm still on chapter books and stuff and I can't read well enough in front of the teacher" [16, F, 10, 05/09/01]. She was the only grade two student to use the word middle. Her goal was one of performance. She felt good because she was mastering the skill of reading aloud without errors, an indication she took to mean that she understood what she read, even though that it is not necessarily the case. Tulsa's response was another example of narrowing.

When asked, how does reading make you feel, there appeared to have been a change or shift in the children's thinking by the end of grade four that was unlike the kindergarteners who in

general felt good toward reading and for the twos, who noted how they felt depended on the book they were reading. Faith, Fania, Freya and Foster remained generally positive toward reading, as Foster noted, "Makes me feel happy inside when I'm reading good books" [25, M, 06, 05/16/01]. But five of the children described reading as an activity that fits a need. Although Finlay responded that a book could make him sad or excited, he also explained, "I don't know, if I'm upset I just do whatever and sometimes when I'm bored is usually when I read, and every night I read" [24, M, 06, 05/15/01]. Whereas the general disposition toward reading appears to remain positive, reading does not have pride of place; reading is not central to their lives. The significance of reading in their lives narrowed and diminished as they grew older and advanced through school.

All 27 children when asked how reading made them feel [06] described positive reading affect. The most articulate response came from Tripp. Tripp, when asked how reading made him feel, seemed to be describing the essence of being "lost in a book" (Nell, 1988). He responded, "It makes me feel, like when I'm reading a chapter book, in my head it kinda makes me feel like ah the last time, like lots of time has passed, how much time has really passed. Like say I'm reading for fun and I try to cover the whole book in like five minutes, I feel like I'm reading it in four minutes like I feel eehh, eeh..." Probed if the feeling depended on what he read and if he could tell me more, he clarified, "Yah, if I'm reading like a book like this [indicated picture book] I'm usually reading it aloud to my brothers so I don't really feel the same cause it's well, I'm actually saying the words. It takes less time I think when you are reading it to yourself." In addition to this metacognitive observation, he went on to describe more than his pleasure in his own ability. Building on the idea of a different book, I probed, if you were reading an Animorph book, would you feel differently about that than if say you were reading a book about Mexico? [The children had been working on a project on Mexico in social studies]. Tripp responded as follows, "Yah, I guess I would." How come? "Well because I'm INTO Animorphs! [His voice was raised with strong emotion]. I don't really read a lot of

different other books than Animorphs. So I'm really into Animorphs. I don't want to read any other books unless I'm at school doing..." Projects, I interjected thinking of Mexico, "Yah, I guess so and sometimes and during DEAR [everyone drops everything and reads] and DEAR B [DEAR B was a silent reading session by oneself]. I would read these books [indicated picture book again]. Any Animorphs in the school library I've already read them all" [15, M, 06, 05/09/01].

Later when responding to what makes a book a favorite in school [21], Tripp responded, " I think it's when you read it over and over again and you don't really need other books a lot, like you're really 'Oh I want to read this book again!' I think it's just a good liking of a book and a very good knowing of how a book turns out and a very good liking of how it turns out." He added, "And how, how the sentences are, you know, like with good words how they describe so much stuff" [15, M, 21, 05/09/01].

Tripp had the highest reading proficiency level of the grade two children so his reason for reading that particular science fiction series could not be said to be based on fear of his ability to read other types of material. He also enjoyed reading expository science books [24], finding both equally intellectually engaging. I inferred that Tripp shares his love of science with his dad because his dad gave him a series of science-fiction books called Tom Swift that he read when he was a child and he now reads these to his son.

Tripp did not speak to the issue of how long a book should take to read, like this has 32 pages and this has 120 pages, it was more his perception of how quickly he could get to that space in his head where time was lost, time could go by and he would not know how much but it seemed like minutes not hours. He was so involved in the story. The example he gave was so powerful because he used a picture book and a chapter book. Tripp certainly implied that he had moved into a cognitively and affectively illustrated space. Those who continue to gain positive experience with reading whether it was fiction or non-fiction have expectations of pleasure. Reading pleasure or

enjoyment can thus be seen as gaining in knowledge; the children are still accessing the content of a text whether the material is narrative or expository.

Tripp projected a strong sense of anticipation for reading a particular series of children's books and implied that somehow the creation of his mental representations were in response to his affect while reading each book. Although he did not refer to a complex literary text such as those utilized by Miall (1989; 1995) while working with college students, I have to wonder at some basic level, whether Tripp's heightened anticipation makes him more aware of "foregrounding" or stylistic devices like the levels of language in the text, phonetic, grammatical, and semantic? (Miall, 1995, p. 283). For example, in the prologue of *The Hork-Bajir Chronicles* (Animorphs) Applegate (1998) makes use of both ellipsis and oxymoron and Tripp enjoyed these.

The most noticeable aspect about affect demonstrated by the children in my study is that it shifts. A single child can experience all three levels of reading affect (association, conceptualization, and self-direction), depending on the book, the reading environment, and who is attendant while reading is occurring. The associative and conceptual levels of affect appear to be reciprocal because when readers see their ability in a positive light, their associations with the experience are pleasurable, and consequently they want to repeat the experience thereby advancing themselves to a level of self-direction, the highest level of affect. The affective circumstances or conditions of the earlier experience including the people and the places involved are alive in memory and appear to influence subsequent reading experiences.

The dynamic role of positive affect in reading is that it keeps children reading; they are motivated to search for pleasure and involvement, to develop favorite material to be read and reread, and to gain more control over reading. Positive affect is the motivator, the force aiding in the choice of reading as an activity even after finishing a book. Positive affect allowed the children to rate themselves well and implement strategies that helped them to improve and acquire

independence in reading. These positive perceptions likely were stimulated by the parents and gained momentum at home at a time when the children started to make associations with what was read and engaged in negotiation during reading. With schooling came a narrowing of the children's perception of themselves as readers and of the pleasure of reading in general. As ability to read and answer questions on content became more important in school than reading for enjoyment, reading seemed to move into a separate niche in the children's lives; it became more of a side activity for some. Reading at home was fundamental to the children's positive associations with and negotiation in reading at the outset. To create a school environment that builds on those associations and fosters negotiation is clearly a challenge.

Home Support is Fundamental to Positive Association and Negotiation

Home was generally the place where the children's perceived needs, abilities, aspirations, characteristics, and drives appeared to be supported both verbally and non-verbally in a positive manner. The children not only associated home, the circumstance and the situation with reading for pleasure but perceived home in a positive light at the conceptual level as well. Their responses confirmed how families play a significant role in children's engagement with reading (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). An in-depth look at those foundational associations and the negotiation process as children engage with reading follows. The children's articulations concern the level of sibling and parent influence, the value placed upon reading, the approach used to help the children learn to read, resources made available such as time, place, choice and ownership of reading material, as well as the entrance by some into a community of readers. These articulations indicated that social contexts contribute to how meaning is shaped and that cognition and affect work together (Ruddell & Unrau, 1994).

Reading as a Social Event with Siblings

Of the 27 children in the study, four (Kristy, Tor, Tulsa, and Felix) are only children and the others have at least one sibling either older or younger at home. Five of the kindergarten children had older siblings, but it was Kora and Kieran who spoke with pleasure about being read to by them. Kieran's enthusiastic comment is of note, when his older brother read him a bedtime story, Kieran read the story back, "Like when [brother's name] reads me a bedtime story, I read him a bedtime story, but, like the same one that he read me so I can remember the whole story like really quick!" [05, M, 12, 05/09/01]. Kieran has described a negotiated reading.

Seven of the grade twos had older and/or younger siblings. Teresa and Titus did not read to their younger siblings. Teresa did not believe her three-year-old brother could read. Titus thought that his grade one sister did not like to read, he responded, "She reads but she never likes to...Well because my mom said [to her], Start reading, because you're not reading enough, just set the book down and just start again quietly" [13, M, 12, 05/08/01]. Neither Teresa nor Titus read to their parents. Tully and Tyler commented that they "sometimes" read to their respective younger and older brothers, Tanner responded with obvious enjoyment that he read, "Yes, to mom and dad and my sisters and sometimes I read to Bandit. He's my aunt's dog. He's funny" [10, M, 12, 05/07/01]. His family also read to him, "They read me storybooks when I'm going to sleep and sometimes they read me like chapter books, that's fun" [10, M, 16, 05/07/01]. The interplay of reading to and being read to by the family underpins the positive reading affect held by Tanner. Clearly he associated reading with pleasure and has had the opportunity to negotiate and construct his own meanings in the process.

Among the nine grade fours, Faith, Ferdinand, Finlay and Foster read to their younger siblings but Fania was the only one who read to her older siblings (sisters). Frederica described being read to by her older brother and the activity, although made at her request, did not sound like

a pleasant experience because he acquiesced to read with her only because his mom made him. Frederica speculated, "He likes reading by himself, I think" [26, F, 12, 05/22/01].

Kelly although she agreed when her younger sister wanted a book read noted, "Yah, so I read to her a book that she really likes with little words like up and down, open and shut, ...but there's one book that she can read because there's pictures and then there's the word under but she just uses the picture" [02, F, 12, 05/04/01]. Although only six years old, Kelly believed she knew how well her preschool sister was reading. Later when talking to me in response to the question what is reading she became angry stating, "That's called my little sister! What she really likes to do is called playing. She doesn't get it, like that's why she only gets one or two words because she doesn't try over and over" [02, F, 05/04/01]! I suspect that older siblings, like Kelly, may pass on their judgment of younger children's efforts in learning to read, either verbally or non-verbally, and the judgment may help to create any of the three modes of affect, positive, negative or neutral toward reading. Younger siblings may also compare themselves to their older siblings. Affect according to Izard (2000) is both causal and responsive. It can influence perception, cognition and behavioral action.

Striking was the difference between Thomasina's negative and anxiety ridden description of her oral reading in front of the teacher and other students in class and the following jovial description of reading aloud at home to her brother, "Yes, pretty grim, because he always laughs at me when I read. When I'm reading a funny story and I say a word funny he'd laugh because sometimes I make funny faces when I read the words...and I talk funny" [12, F, 12, 05/08/01]. She appears to have mastered the home environment where participation and negotiation with her brother is relaxed and positive. Interestingly, while her brother did not read to her, she spoke proudly of his reading, "He's nine. He's in grade three. Yes, he has read the fourth Harry Potter already! He has all the books of Harry Potter" [smiling] [12, F, 12, 05/08/01]. Thomasina provided

evidence of the positive reading affect that develops because of the enthusiasm of a sibling who reads a great deal. Research has shown that there is a significant positive relationship between the enthusiasm and amount of reading done by a sibling and the influence such enthusiasm and avid reading can have on other siblings (Hall & Coles, 1999).

Even though more than half (17) of the 27 children read to their older and/or younger siblings, it is clear the activity was not always a pleasurable one. The question then arises whether negative affect can have positive consequences? Robeck and Wallace (1990) do not present negative affect in this light. But there is room for belief that it can (Isen, Daubman & Nowicki, 1987; Nichols, Jones & Hancock, 2003; Pekrun, 1992). Even though Kojo had to listen to texts not of his choosing, he did not describe avoidance of the situation. The fact that his older brothers read to him may have had a positive influence in that he reads lots of books. Although he may not necessarily like what his siblings read to him, his tone of voice indicated that he liked their attention and I speculate that perhaps as a younger sibling he was given unvoiced permission to spend an equal amount of time reading things of his own choosing. In other words, the model or example of reading for pleasure that his siblings showed even though they were not reading something Kojo was interested in pervaded his space and when given the opportunity he too read for pleasure.

Reading as a Social Event with Parents

Although Kristy, Tor, Tulsa, and Felix did not have siblings, they were read to and with the exception of Felix, they asked their parents to read to them. Seven of the kindergarten children read to mom and/or dad and/or a sibling. Kojo's brothers read to him and Kimberly's parents read to her. But conversely they did not read to their parents.

Support in the home for reading was evident for all nine of the kindergarten children. Mom, mom and dad, dad, and/or a sibling, or an extended family member read to the children. Their articulations tell us they have been read to from a young age. The majority of these middle class

kindergarteners (six) were read with and/or to twice a day, after school and at bedtime. Reading together can be seen as a time when children bond socially with a parent or other significant person in the family, it is important that the parents generally exhibit a positive attitude toward reading. Affect functions to the extent that it plays an activating role in children's interest in and desire to stay with the reading task, guides the cognitive goals and strategies children engage before, during, and after reading, and gives children an anticipatory advantage in some genres as well as the power to transform their autonomy. Knowledge of both reading genre and subject content develops children's sense of control and independence in their learning. Reading disposition is in part based on the unvoiced beliefs of those around children whose actions influence their lives (Athey & Homes, 1969, Baker, Scher, & Mackler, 1997; Bus, 2001; DeTemple & Snow, 2001; Leseman & DeJong, 2001).

Four of the grade two students read to their parents as a regular activity, although for Tripp, Tully and Tor it was not a frequent occurrence. For Tripp and Tully it occurred, "Sometimes" [15, M, 12, 05/08/01; 17, M, 12, 05/10/01]. Tor's response was a prime example of how reading aloud to adults at home can be perceived by children as evaluation just as it occurs in school. He responded, "If they really want me to sometimes, if they just want to see how good I am or if they just want me to read to them" [14, M, 12, 05/08/01].

Eight of the grade two children were read to at home. Tully responded that his parents did not read to him. As to why, he ventured, "I don't know" [17, M, 16, 05/10/01]. The sudden realization that his parents did not read to him appeared to leave him puzzled and perplexed, judging by the look on his face, because he did read to his three year old brother and believed in his younger brother's ability to read.

Four of the grade fours implied that they read to their parents regularly, Felipe, Finlay, and Freya did, "Sometimes" [21, M, 12, 05/11/01; 24, M, 12, 05/15/01; 27, F, 12, 05/29/01] and Ferdinand and

Felix did not read to them at all. Seven of the nine grade fours, with the exception of Ferdinand and Foster, were still read to at least some of the time. So in all, seven of the kindergarteners, seven of the grade twos, and six of the grade fours asked to be read to. Clearly they were being supported in the development of their reading ability and thus their positive reading affect by their parents. It is interesting to note that seven of the nine kindergarten children mentioned being read to by both parents, yet in grade two only Tanner mentioned being read to by both parents, and in grade four the numbers go up again as all four of the girls but only Finlay among the boys mentioned both parents reading to them.

What is it the children like about their parents reading to them? The children raised two points (a) they were able to participate in the actual reading, and (b) the voice quality of the parent or extended family member allowed them to create mental pictures, gain clarity, and understanding of text. Most of the grade two children described their reading affect from the perspective of home in positive and, at times, glowing terms. Teresa responded, "Well, I like sometimes for my parents to read to me because they read really neat stories and they read in funny ways. Sometimes my dad does that and he reads when it's an exclamation mark and he lets me read some of it so that's why" [11, F, 16, 05/07/01]. There was a process of discussion and negotiation as to who read what. Sulzby and Teale (1991) noted that during the familial interaction, "the participants cooperatively seek to negotiate meaning" (p. 732). DeTemple and Snow (2001) described the conversations that occur through reading with a parent as "the primary route by which the child gets access to the text" (p. 65).

Another good example came from Faith who sometimes shared reading with her mom, each taking a turn reading a page. She stated, "I like reading by myself but sometimes I'm tired and sometimes it's a really good book and kind of easy and one of my parents will just read it to me." Of her dad she said, "Sometimes he reads it, sometimes it's better to get a clear picture, sometimes it

gets, I don't know, well it's faster" [19, F, 16, 05/04/01]. Fania and Freya also mentioned the notion of a "clear picture" [20, F, 16, 05/10/01; 27, F, 16, 05/29/01]. Frederica noted hearing the oral reading helped her to "understand" [26, F, 16, 05/22/01]. Hearing a parent read with fluency and intonation not only engages the children allowing them to quickly reach a mental space illustrated by story but may also spur or prompt confidence in the children to produce similar renderings.

Of particular note was the reaction of Felipe and Felix. Both enjoyed their parents reading to them but, both wore sheepish expressions on their faces when voicing their appreciation of their parents reading as though they had gotten too old for this particular activity. Felix was adamant that he did not ask his mom to read. She had asked him if she could read to him and Felix described it as "this really incredible book" [22, M, 16, 05/11/01].

Kora provided an example of a different kind. She did not like the way her father read to her. Kora observed being able to see the pictures as the story was being read was important. She said he sat behind her and after he read a page then he would give her the book to look at the pictures and she would give the book back to him so he could continue reading, with mom on the other hand, "I get to sit next to her like I do when I read with everybody else" [07, F, 16, 05/16/01].

Family Values

As discussed earlier, seven of the kindergarten children and all of the grades two and four students perceived that knowing how to read was important to their families [19]. Kora noted, for example, that her mom liked her and her sisters to read to each other. Some of the other responses implied a high level of egocentrism, for example, "It's important to me...." [Tripp, 15, M, 19, 05/08/01; Teresa, 11, F, 19, 05/07/01; Tully, 17, M, 19, 05/10/01]. How the children expressed themselves was an indication of what parents "do" as opposed to for example, "how" we think all middle class families behave (Greaney & Hegarty, 1987). The children described dads and moms reading to their children, parents who talked to their children about books, and parents who provided time and

resources for reading, but sometimes they also described parents who were busy and/or controlling. For example, sometimes when Kelly asked her parents to read to her, she noted, "But then when they have to go and do something right in the middle of the book, I just finish reading it" [02, F, 16, 05/04/01]. Ferdinand did not ask his parents to read to him. He explained, "Both my parents are busy. My dad is always at work. My mom always has the baby so..." and his voice trailed away [23, M, 16, 05/15/01]. Recall as well that Knute would not discuss what occurred in the reading session with his parents. Looking at earlier examples of the older siblings reading to younger siblings, (Kojo or Kelly), I speculate that older siblings would not necessarily be able to negotiate meanings with younger children so that it is probably more pleasurable for older brothers and sisters to read to babies because then they remain in control of the reading. As younger siblings wish to take on more control, a parent being more knowledgeable about the needs, abilities, and drives of the child would be in a better position to reassure and validate the child's meaningful negotiations. Kelly found her younger sister's efforts to read frustrating. Her efforts or perceived lack of them in fact made Kelly angry making me wonder how long before her little sister began to question that anger and perhaps her own ability to read.

Of course not all parents are patient either. Some parents may not want to relinquish control and let negotiations start. Kimberly is a good example of someone in such a situation. She explained, "It's very important to listen when somebody reads to me. You have to listen to the teacher too" [04, F, 19, 05/09/01]. Ferdinand's mom did not think he read. He explained that she came to check on him and he hid the fact that he read from her [10]. Kieran explained that his mom thought that if his books had dust on them that he did not read them. Home is not a perfect place. In Kieran's case his dad read to him and allowed him to participate in the reading by letting Kieran interrupt and ask questions and make comments [16]. Kieran appeared to be receiving mixed messages within his own home and he seemed to be making a choice. Robeck and Wallace (1990)

described affective conceptualizations (the second level of affect) in terms of self as "the summation of the comparisons each person makes between self and others: a sibling, certain classmates, the real or imagined model among significant adults or peers" (p. 36). Kieran's mom cannot be the significant model of reading in his life. He has continued to read and did not avoid the reading situation. Even when reading situations were not ideal, there appeared to be an effort on the part of the children to maintain their positive associations with and positive dispositions toward reading. Kelly and Knute's previous articulations show indirectly that their families value reading, but that the children themselves may have difficulty with how they learned to read at home. In Knute's case, there is a strong sense that the emphasis at home was put on the skill of reading. In Kimberly's case, as already noted, she had to listen to and she remained dependent on her parents who were in control of the reading situation. It seems then that the interactions both verbal and non-verbal occurring during familial reading times have not been consistently positive and therefore the positive support was inconsistent for some of the children (Bus, 2001; Sulzby & Teale, 1991).

Learning How to Read

All of the children aspired to read and as home is perceived as the place where children's aspirations are most likely to be supported, parents are most likely the first people to be involved in the children's learning. The question of learning how to read [13] according to the children is shared between home and school and the perception of where they learned changes over time but not who supports them.

Among the kindergarten children only Kimberly and Kieran said they were learning to read in school. They, like the other seven, expressed their belief that they had learned or were learning to read at home [13]. Support for learning was both verbal and non-verbal according to the children, Kora's response illustrates this point, "When, why I heard before, when I didn't know how to read,

my mommy and daddy and my big sister. So then I started, so that way I started practicing some words and some book reading" [07, F, 13, 05/15/01]. We can hear the positive associations that she has had with reading when both her parents and her older sister read to her. These experiences were supportive as she described being willing to try reading for herself. Later she described reading a schoolbook out loud and the excitement of her parents when she figured out how to read the word, "purple", "Because it had two ps, and pink only has one p and purple has two and when mommy and daddy heard they ran into the room and then they told [named sister]" [07, F, 13, 05/15/01]. The praise was felt. Descriptions give voice to the behaviors the children perform as they learn to read; Kora was using visual analysis as a cue (Clay, 1979). Her description, as well as others', provides a visualization or mental picture of the nature of the support that parents give to children as they negotiate their way through the process of reading.

The experience of learning to read as has already been noted was not necessarily pleasant, but rather described by some as hard and frustrating (Thomasina, Tor and Tripp). Thomasina explained the reason learning to read was difficult for her was, "Because if I got to a word like 'and' I would always say 'mad' or something" [12, F, 13, 05/08/01]. But, like the children in kindergarten, she remembered her mom and dad read to her a lot from a fairy tale book belonging to her dad. She explained that after hearing one particular story many times she tried to read it for herself commenting, "It's a very hard book." Aside from their dedication and persistence revealed by comments such as, "I just kept trying and trying every single day and eventually I found a strategy, just sound it out" [Tor, 14, M, 13, 05/08/01], Tyler responded, "I started reading in preschool and my mommy and daddy always said I had to read for five minutes every day and now I'm in school they say I read 100" [laughing]. Asked how he had done it, he noted, "Well if I got a word wrong my teacher would tell me. Or my mom and dad might tell me if I was wrong" [18, M, 13, 05/10/01]. The children not only described the difficulties of the "rite of passage" of learning to read

but also their articulations described how it is that parents and teachers support children in learning to read. The difficulties experienced by these middle class children could have caused them to avoid reading or so Robeck and Wallace (1990) would suggest. The children managed, however, with support from their families to describe how they passed through them.

By grade four though, the children (eight in grade four) saw school as the location where they learned to read from little books. Felipe also described the strategies he implemented, "I used to use my finger otherwise cause I used to forget and I'd skip a line or something, then, I just "ahh" with some words. Some I just sounded them out and got them but the others that I had to sound out I couldn't get some and I'd ask my teacher and she'd tell me them and I'd just check when I see some" [21, M, 13, 05/11/01]. Even though the children responded that they learned to read in school, only Foster, Felix, and Felipe did not mention their parents as being at least partly responsible for their learning to read.

Resources

In terms of approaches to learning to read, we have heard of the use of simple easy books and oral reading by adults and children as well as the use of various strategies. Parent and teacher support was carried out through verbal negotiation of meaning and in Felipe's case allowing him to use a specific strategy which helped him to maintain comprehension. Parents further support and collaborate in their children's reading pleasure by making resources available to them. Resources can allow them to become self-directed and may include time, place, choice, and ownership of reading material. Parents and adults can also provide entrance into a community of readers by sharing and discussing books on shared interests or through joining book clubs together.

Time and Place. Not only the people but time and place have had an effect on the development of the children's accumulated positive reading affect. All nine of the kindergarten children read after supper, before bed and six also read after school [14] and the bedroom was the

favorite place to read for six of them with Kojo, Kora and Kristy preferring a more social setting like the playroom or living room [15]. Kieran said his favorite time to read, "It's a time when my family is altogether like at dinnertime and we're all together and I, I pick out a story and I rememberize it and I ah, I just read it to the family" [05, M, 14, 05/09/01]. Many of the parents of these children can be seen to encourage their children to read because they provide time for the children to do it. Reading is an event included in the daily routine of the home.

For the grade twos, seven preferred to read at night in bed, the exceptions being Tully who read in the morning and Titus, whose favorite time was, "When it's quiet time, if I just come back from a hockey game, if I'm really tired" [13, M, 14, 05/08/01]. He brings his pillow into the closet, closes the door and turns on the light, "It's quiet" [13, M, 14, 05/08/01]. For eight of the grade fours their favorite time to read was before going to bed [14]. Felix liked to read in the morning and on weekends in his own or his parents' bedroom. The favorite place to read was obviously bed [15]. The couch seemed to be the next most likely location to read, so said Faith, Felipe, Felix, Finlay, and Freya. Interestingly, Fania's favorite place to read was also a closet, her sister's, "Cause she keeps it really nice and clean and she has a little wooden chair and table and I take my flashlight and go and read in there and then no one can interrupt me" [20, F, 15, 05/10/01]. A favorite place is evidence of positive affect, a place where the children have some control over the reading situation. Just as with a favorite book, a favorite place is a place you can return to over and over again and feel free and safe to read, a sanctuary where it is quiet and you will not be interrupted. Another location where the children found pleasure reading was in the car. Six kindergarteners, eight grade twos and six of the grade fours read in the car. All of these children were provided with time and a place by their parents to read and the children had access to books.

Choice. All nine of the kindergarten children, responding to who chooses their reading material, reported choosing their own reading material [17]. Six were able to choose what they

wanted to read all of the time Kora, Kimberly and Kieran mentioned their parents as having a say in what they read. In terms of the theory of affect, the children appear to continue to have positive associations with reading. It is possible though that Kora's parents choosing books for her implies a lack of confidence in her ability to choose her own reading material. When describing books that she has read in the car she explained, "My mom usually picks up easy books for me to read" [*07, F, 15, 05/15/01*].

In grade two, Tanner, Tor and Tyler reported that "sometimes" their parents either mom or dad chose their books. Tanner was the first and only child to mention choosing a book at the suggestion of friends, "I choose, sometimes my parents choose, people choose. My friends do, sometimes they do. They just, when I'm looking at the books, they might be there and then they say, 'Tanner, read this,' or something. Sometimes I might pick it. I'll say, 'OK, I'll read it" [10, M, 17, 05/07/01]. Tor described being evaluated by his mom and Tyler, although being able to choose his books "most of the time" revealed that his mom chooses what she will read to him [18, M, 17, 05/10/01]. Tripp was representative of all the other grade twos. He was amazed by the question, as though, who did I think was going to choose his books! "Nobody! I just choose my own books and at the library my mom says it's maximum like five, except, I usually pick seven cause I'm like finished them by the end of the week but I get to keep them for like three weeks. So, I get two more weeks to read them" [He was visibly excited by the prospect] [15, M, 17, 05/08/01]! There appears to be a balance in the control of what Tripp reads between Tripp and his mom; he chooses the books, she limits the number. Only Fania and Foster in grade four noted that others are involved in the choice of their reading material. Fania's sisters sometimes choose what they are going to read. But Foster indicated, "Usually my mom or my dad" at home and in school, "The teacher" chooses what books will be read in literature circles [25, M, 17, 05/16/01]. The only time Foster described being in control of his reading was when he went to the school library to choose a book for scheduled

reading time in the classroom, "You can take it to class and you can just read it to yourself" [25, M, 29, 05/16/01]. His access seemed to be restricted and yet he still associated reading with pleasure perhaps because in at least one instance he had control.

Ownership. All 27 of the children responded that they owned books [18]. By buying books for their children parents support and endorse reading as a worthwhile activity. They are giving the children access to and control over important aspects of positive reading affect. Access to and ownership of books afforded the children opportunities to choose not only what to read but, when to read, allowing positive associations to continue to develop thereby giving them a sense of autonomy and self-direction in their reading, the third level of affect.

Aside from owning books which the children get through books stores, as gifts and from book clubs, they enjoyed borrowing books from the public library and the school library. Twenty four children in all, eight at each grade level described the pleasure of receiving books as gifts and interestingly it seems that as the grades increased so did the use of the school library. In kindergarten the children made reference to their take-home book which had to be read and brought back each day. Although seven of the children enjoyed going to the public library to borrow books, only two kindergarten children specifically mentioned the school library as being a place to borrow books. Six of the grade twos mentioned the public library as a regular place to obtain books and five mentioned the school library but two noted the latter was not a regular practice. Among the grade fours, for the first time two children noted that they do not own many books. Seven of the grade fours used the public library regularly, but two did not use it at all. Frederica actually did not like going there because sometimes she did not like the books [26, F, 18, 05/22/01]. In total, eight of the children, the highest number of students among the three grades responded that they made use of the school library. It may not be their first choice, in fact Finlay noted he "rarely gets them from school" [24, M, 18, 05, 15/01]. But next to buying them Faith, Felipe, Felix and Frederica

accessed books from the school library and Fania, Ferdinand, Foster and Freya also borrowed books from there. It just was not the first place they mentioned. It might be their second or third choice. I think the reason for the increased use of the school library from kindergarten to grade four is that many of the children borrow school and classroom library books for in-school reading. As already noted books from home rarely come to school. For children who do not get to the public library, the school and classroom libraries can provide ready access to books.

The children's responses indicate their awareness that the people, the place, the event, and the books they chose themselves allowed them to initiate access to and sustain control over reading material. Being able to sustain control, they become engaged and remain involved. Involvement leads to perseverance, independence, and autonomy in reading. Supportive parents are a major force in children's positive reading affect. They and teachers can also introduce children to a much broader community of like-minded people.

Communities of Readers. When the subject of book clubs arose, Faith responded "My mom and I are in a mother/daughter book club." Probed to tell more, she responded, "Yah, it's usually once a month and we'll go to someone's house and the person whose house it is they get to pick the book. And like when we picked the book, we picked Ella Enchanted (Levine, 1997) and the book was about fairies and sometimes we'll make a snack about like the book and we made a fairy food cake which is an angel food cake but we changed it and then another person's house it was called Lyddie (Paterson, 1991) and it was the kind of book where the recipe was from the book" [*19, F, 18, 05/04/01*]. I was reminded that when talking with Frederica about reading with her family she too mentioned a book club. Her class has a reading club, "So, there's these little sheets and then whenever you read twenty minutes or something minutes then you get to sign one. So I read to my parents and then they sign one. Sometimes I just do it too for fun to read. After we fill out one form then we get a fish and the fish goes up onto this bulletin board and then when we

finish all the way...we get a pajama party" [*26, M, 12, 05/22/01*]! Both girls are describing supportive situations for reading, one at home, the other at school, and both situations are extrinsic in nature. Although we do not see extrinsic rewards as being foundational to positive associations and negotiation in reading, the participants see reading in these two cases as pleasurable and valuable. Meanings are shared and negotiated much more fully because of the magnitude of the scale of the community and the regularity of opportunity to read.

Felix mentioned a number of ideas and issues that are also of interest in terms of support. He informed me that, "When there's YRCA, I have to stop reading my books and go to those books, Young Readers Choice Award (YRCA). You read as many of the YRCA as you can and choose the best one. Whichever one gets the most votes wins and it's from all over the world." He found it easier to use the school library, "Because all of the chapter books are in one place but in the public library, they're scattered about." Finally, when we were discussing book clubs he explained, "I don't usually buy them I usually get them just for little gifts. Like sometimes at Costco my mom just buys, I think it's a seven pack of Hardy Boy books. She bought two of those packs and I'm still working on them." When I queried, "So your mom supplies you with reading material?" he laughed and responded, "Yah, sometimes new, sometimes old." I was interested in knowing whether his mom read children's books because he had explained, when asked to rate his own reading [10], that his mom was a retired elementary school teacher and she had given him books to read from grades five and six (her grades) and even as high as grade eight, now he responded, "Well she doesn't read much anymore. I don't know why" [22, M, 18, 05/11/01]. Although she no longer reads much in the way of children's books, she does sponsor and endorse his reading.

Home support is fundamental to positive associations with reading and negotiation in reading and provides the impetus for the how, when, and where of the children's reading. Siblings as well as parents can have both a positive and a negative influence on children's affect in

response to and toward reading. How children are taught to read and are supported in the process by their parents at home and their teachers in school remains a critical aspect of the development and growth of the children's positive reading affect. Allowing time and space for personal reading by the children and taking time to read and allow discussion about what is being read is further evidence of support which encourages positive reading affect. The main difference is that the younger children see home as the place where they learned to read, but by the time they have reached grade four school is seen as the place where they learned. Yet home all through the grades is seen as the mainstay of verbal and non-verbal support for positive reading affect.

As noted, school is not always seen as providing support for children who are learning to read and want to continue to read to learn. Some children may indeed perceive school as an environment in which their expectations for reading are not being fulfilled. One possible reason is that schools may not support self-direction, the third highest and most complex level of reading affect. Not being able to direct themselves may lead to neutral or negative affect and certainly unfulfilled expectations on the part of the children.

Children are Vulnerable to Classroom Situations and Teacher Control

According to Robeck and Wallace (1990) to reach a level of creative self-direction there is a fusion of cognition and affect. They state, "Knowing one's own identity, strengths, weaknesses and values is the source of self-motivation and the basis for self-direction...Children must feel the self-mastery of the printed page at some level in order to make the transition to read for their own self-directed purpose" (p. 38). In other words, even though Kimberly was at the point in the reading process where she read only the pictures, she was self-directed in that she wanted to learn to read the printed page.

School is the place where it is perceived that children will become independent and self-directed in their reading and that the pleasure of reading will be modeled and developed by those

who teach them. In my study, given the children's vulnerability due to their young age and their emergent stage in the reading process, my expectations were that the teacher would be cognizant and supportive of their interests and would endeavor to keep affect within the realm of the positive. The children described the need for the availability of resources such as time, choice, availability of material, and the provision of a safe and comfortable environment where questioning is encouraged and valued. Unfortunately the children did not describe reading in school in the effusive terms with which they described reading at home. The children indicated that the associations that they had with reading in school were not necessarily positive. The negotiation process in school was accompanied by public performance and evaluation. Further, when children moved to the level of self-direction, their ability appeared to have been ignored. From the children's point of view the teacher gave the impression of being uninterested. The enthusiasm for pleasure reading was not being readily transferred to reading for purposes of school in the later years.

Reading as a Social Event with the Teacher

Kennedy, Kimberly, Kieran, and Kojo happily indicated that they were asked questions about their reading by the teacher, but none of the grade twos responded in a like manner and only Faith and Freya of the grade fours reported enthusiastically that questioning occurred regularly.

Those kindergarteners who reported that the teacher asked them questions about what they read reported that they liked it. But Kristy who stated she was only asked, "Sometimes" said she would be able to answer questions and she could show her [the teacher] the book [09, F, 25, 05/23/01]. Kora said she would like the teacher to ask her about what she reads. "So she knows what I'm going to read. So she'd have to tell her so that way she'd know" [07, F, 25, 05/15/01]. Kora's voice sounded both disappointed and needful. Both Kayla and Kelly repeated their negative response a second time leaving me with the sense that something was lacking – their teacher's interest.

Although Tyler responded that the teacher asked him questions, when probed if he liked that he declared, "No, I'd like zero questions" [18, M, 25, 05/10/01]! Seven of the other eight grade two children did not know why the teacher did not ask about what they were reading. Tulsa provided an explanation; she described a type of log book that was read by the teacher where basic information including how long they had spent reading and their reaction to the book was included, which suggests that the teacher did not need to interact with them. Teresa, Tulsa, and Tully like Tyler did not want any questions and the rest were unsure. The logbook does not help to explain though why Tripp would think that the teacher noticed how good his reading was but that "She doesn't want to talk about it" [15, M, 10, 05/09/01]. In the case of the grade fours, it appeared that questioning by the teacher was not based on mutual liking and curiosity about the material, but rather evaluation of the students. Freya and her group presented a Jeopardy Game as their final presentation for the literature cirlce book, for her novel book report Freya stated, "She'll give us a little booklet and then you'll say if you wanted to make up another title, you could do that and you'd have to write the title. Then she'd ask you the questions and stuff. Like who are the characters and how much pages there were in the book and whether or not you liked the book" [27, F, 25, 05/29/01]. With regard to literature circles, Finlay figured the teacher did not ask questions because, "Well that's pretty much what lit circles is, often she hears our group talking" [24, M, 25, 05/15/01]. One of the activities of the participants, as already noted, is to develop a list of questions for the others to discuss. The teacher is not one of the literature circle participants. She circulates among the groups and they know they are being evaluated (Almasi, 1995).

A teacher is expected to engage children so that they can become self-directed in reading and learning. The children have described a desire starting in kindergarten of wanting the teacher to ask questions about what they read to quite the reverse by grade four. There was a sense that questions had right answers so what was the point of dialogue with the teacher? There appeared

to be no room for negotiation. The teacher was in control. The only way for the children to maintain control would be to not talk to the teacher about books that were of interest to them! The notion of children being asked for their opinion by a teacher would appear to be novel, at least for Tripp. When we had completed the interview, I asked if he had any questions for me and he asked me why I was asking kids' questions. He thought it was a good idea that someone asked them if they liked reading but when asked if anyone had ever asked him before, he roared with laughter saying in disbelief, "No! No! No" [15, M, 05/08/01]!

By grade four, if not before, the classroom (in this study at least) was a place where children performed publicly and were evaluated. The reading affect was on balance negative in the classroom and the children seemed to practice passive avoidance. This is not avoidance as described by Robeck and Wallace (1990) because the children in my study for the most part had broken the code, they felt a sense of mastery, and they were intrinsically motivated to read.

Role of Text: Computers and Books

When Kojo was first asked what he liked to read he responded, "Books" [08, M, 01, 05/18/01]. Books attract with their physical attributes (Mathewson, 1976). Children need to feel an interest in the content (Schraw, Bruning, & Svobada, 1995); control over (Pressley, Rankin, & Yokoi, 1996) and engagement with text so they can coordinate their strategies and gain knowledge (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). But for children today reading also occurs on the computer. The physical aspects still affect the students as Kora said she moved around, "Just pictures of things" [07, F, 27, 05/15/01]. Although all of the children read on computers in school, not all of them enjoyed it. Only six of the kindergarten children described it as "cool." Kelly had one program at home that she played, but she never played it at school even though the program was there. Her explanation was, "Well because the teachers usually pick where we sit and they put in the games. They just pick a game and slide it in. We never know what we are playing" [02, F, 27, 05/04/01].

Only six of the grade twos enjoyed it as well. Thomasina, Tripp and Tyler enjoyed reading their own stories written in PowerPoint; Tripp, Tyler, Tully and Tulsa liked the Internet and Thomasina liked typing. Negative responses indicated that typing was not pleasurable for all. Teresa responded, "No, I type on the computer, stories and stuff" [11, F, 27, 05/08/01]. Titus saw it as, "it's kind of work" [13, M, 27, 05/08/01] and Tor preferred books, "No, It's just that I like to read books I guess" [14, M, 27, 05/08/01].

Only Faith, Ferdinand, Finlay, and Freya in grade four found the computer "cool" with Felipe being a possible fifth. He stated, "Except when I'm on a website cause lots of the time they have, you know, interesting stuff" [21, M, 27, 05/11/01]. The grade fours' responses were similar to the twos', "a hot story," [Faith, 19, F, 27, 05/04/01] and "Just fun, just different from a book" [Ferdinand 23, M, 27, 05/15/01]. Neither Frederica nor Fania liked it. Felix thought, "I find it's just the same as anything else because it's words. Words are the same as in books. But I don't count it as like, we have home reading time. But I don't count that as actual reading time because it's more clicking and browsing more than just reading" [22, M, 27, 05/11/01]. Foster responded, "It's not as good as reading out of a book" [25, M, 27, 05/16/01]. In my study, although it would appear that the computer is seen as another tool for learning, at least one-third of the children do not enjoy working on them in school. The question arises: Does all text, given its medium, have the same power to entice a child back to reading? Apparently not, at least for these children. So the medium itself has the power to attract or detract. Are the children even less their own agent when it comes to computer programs? This is an important question for future research.

Storybooks and fiction. The children responded to three questions under the heading of school that dealt with storybooks and information books and their preferences for either or both. All 27 children liked storybooks or fiction. Why? Neither Kayla nor Kora answered that question but the other 25 did.

- They came from special people [Kelly, 02, F, 22, 05/04/01],
- "My mom or dad usually reads them to me...it's comforting, somewhat" [Tripp, 15, M, 22, 05//08/01].
- Pictures [Kelly, 02, F, 22, 05/04/01; Kojo, 08, M, 22, 05/18/01; Tyler, 18, M, 21, 05/10/01; Fania, 20, F, 05/10/01],
- Humor [Kelly, 02, F, 22, 05/04/01; Tanner, 10, M, 22,05/07/01; Titus 13, M, 22, 05/08/01; Faith, 19, F, 22, 05/04/01; Fania, 20, F, 21, 05/10/01],
- The story [Thomasina, 12, F, 22, 05/08/02; Felipe, 21, M, 22. 05/11/01; Felix, 22, M, 21, 05/11/01],
- Lots of stories [Kennedy, 03, M, 22, 05/08/01],
- Opportunities to read [Kristy, 09, F, 22, 05/23/01],
- Short and big books, [Kimberly, 04, F, 22, 05/09/01]
- Excitement [Kieran, 05, M, 22, 05/09/01; Tor, 14. M, 22, 05/08/01; Tyler, 18, M, 21, 05/10/01; Faith, 19, F, 22, 05/04/01],
- Fun to read [Knute, 06, M, 22, 05/11/01; Freya, 27, F, 22, 05/29/01],
- Characters [Tulsa, 16, F, 22, 05/09/01],
- Make-believe [Teresa, 11, F, 22, 05/07/01; Ferdinand, 23, M, 22, 05/15/01, Foster, 25, M, 05/16/01],
- Mystery and adventure [Finlay, 24, M, 22, 05/15/01].
- "Every book there is a problem, it always has to be solved, that's why I like books pretty much" [Tully, 17, M, 22, 5/08/01].
- The author, "I like the way that she lived her life and weaved it into her stories" [Frederica, 26, F, 22, 05/22/01].

The children's responses to "what do you like to read?" in which they described narrative, expository and genre among a host of subjects were different from "why do you like to read storybooks?" Factors such as family (McKenna, Kear & Ellsworth, 1995); the value placed on reading (Athey, 1982); length of story (long or short) (Mathewson, 1976); engagement with the content such that the reading is exciting and fun (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000); and ability (Chapman & Tunmer, 1995) were all raised by the children as part of their positive affect in response to and toward reading storybooks. Kristy's response, "I like storybooks because I get to read them," indicates not only her access to but also her ability to understand storybooks and evident anticipation of the event, which is a reciprocating function of positive affect [09, F, 22, 05/23/01]. But, what about information books?

Information books and expository texts. Eight of both the kindergarten and grade twos liked information books. Tully and Kelly did not. Kelly stated, "I sorta think they're boring. I don't know, I'm just not really, I'm not really curious about stuff" [*02, F, 23, 05/04/01*]. Was her description of herself, based on her concept of her competence in reading, difficulty with reading, or her reading attitude, the areas of self-concept noted by Chapman and Tunmer (1995)? Or could it be lack of interest (Schraw, Bruning & Svoboda, 1995; Shnayer, 1969)? Or, does she not like them because she does not read them? She may not want to admit to failure or to accept the challenge; she may be content to stay within her perceived comfort zone. Perhaps someone has made a comment about her reading, judged her and found her wanting. In any case, implicit in her statement is that her past affective experiences with information books were not positive and according to Robeck and Wallace (1990) once the comparison is made with others at the conceptual level, negative affect is set. I suspect the comparison was made more than once or by more than one person because of the children's previous descriptions of their implicit search for positive affect.

Of the positive responses from all three grade levels those that made reference to school were linked to learning and getting better grades. Kristy stated, "I get to find books, information books because then, it's kind of like homework but, then, I get to read them with my mom and dad" [09, F, 23, 05/23/01] and Kieran explained, "Well because I find out how to read the words" [05, M, 23, 05/09/01]. He noted also that he wanted to be a paleontologist. Tanner responded, "Well, there's knowledge in it and you can get grades easier, get to higher grades very quick." For him reading information books, "Makes you proud and smart" [10, M, 23, 05/07/01]. Teresa brought up social studies material, "Oh the Mexico stuff, oh that's what we're studying so I really like to learn about Mexico and that's why I read it" [11, F, 23, 05/05/01]. Thomasina wanted to learn about soccer. Tripp liked science and got books from the library. Tulsa and Tyler liked learning about animals. Tyler wanted to work with animals when he grew up, "I want to study animals and everything I can" [18, M, 23, 05/23/01]. Only Felipe, Finlay, Foster, and Freya in grade four stated they liked information books. Felipe, Freya and Finlay specifically liked information books on animals, they did not read any other kind. Faith thought they were good for information. The phrase, "not really" came from Felix, Ferdinand and Frederica. Fania's response is reminiscent of Kelly's; "I don't really read information books cause I like storybooks better" [20, F, 23, 05/10/01]. What has happened? Do the grade four children see reading information books in school as not pleasurable?

When Faith was responding to why she wanted to read more in school she noted, "It's funner than science and stuff" [19, F, 20, 05/04/01]. When asked for her preference she noted that in science, "It's boring, all we really do is take notes" [19, F, 24, 05/04/01]. Fania made a similar kind of comment when I probed if she read books in other subjects like socials and she replied, "Yes" but, went on to say she wanted to, "Explore the library and get more books and read them." She continued, "Sometimes I wish that I could just quit social or something when it's boring then I could go and get a book and read it" [20, F, 20, 05/10/01]. Felipe, when asked for his preference, noted "I

like knowing things about animals but, like, when I'm enjoying what I'm reading I don't find that quite as enjoying, reading smaller textbooks" [21, M, 24, 05/11/01]. Ferdinand stated that information books were, "not as exciting" [23, M, 23, 05/15/01]. Frederica stated, "I find information books kind of boring" [26, F, 24, 05/22/01]. She also used the adjective "uninteresting." The grade four students do not describe any negotiation of meaning when describing the reading of non-fiction. It appears that there were only right and wrong answers. Foster is the only grade four student who acknowledged his enjoyment in gaining knowledge. The children appear vulnerable. The question then is, if the vulnerability is due to lack of ability to read non-fiction, have they not been taught how to read non-fiction? Children need to comprehend text if they are to achieve pleasure. Which of the two genres was perceived as providing the most pleasure?

Reading preferences. As to which type of material the children "preferred" to read, there were sometimes as many differences within a grade as across grades. In kindergarten Kayla, Kora and Kieran preferred information books. Kelly, Knute and Kojo preferred storybooks and Kennedy, Kimberly and Kristy liked both. Kayla and Kojo, although their preferences are different, gave the same reason for their choice, "pictures." In grade two, seven of the children liked both storybooks and information books. Tully preferred fiction and Titus, "make believe."

Initially it seemed strange that eight of the grade fours preferred storybooks or fiction to information books, the exception being Foster, who liked both. My presupposition was based on the British Schools Council study (Whitehead, Capey, Maddren & Wellings, 1977) which stated that "Boys read much more non-narrative than girls" (p 279). Barrs (1994) and Minns (1994) as well as the Children's Literature Research Centre in London, England (1996) found that it was not unusual for both boys and girls at the low grade levels to say they read information books, with the topics they chose simply being slightly different. Looking back to the work of Whitehead, Capey, Maddren and Wellings (1977), they had also noted that, "The most striking point about narrative book

reading is that it forms a remarkably high proportion (at least 77%) of the whole" (p. 280). Hall and Coles (1999), twenty years after the Whitehead et al. study found that boys and girls liked narrative. That the grade four boys in my study stated they preferred fiction leaves me to think that they did indeed prefer it. If they were allowed to negotiate meaning when they read fiction, it makes sense that they would prefer it over non-fiction. When Faith was probed if how she felt about reading depended on what she read, she described a movement of looking at pictures on the page to creating pictures in the mind, she explained, "Well yes, if there's more describing it is easier to picture but if it's not real I can picture my own things." Probed if there was a difference between reading an information book or a storybook, she expanded, "In fairytales...you imagine your own picture whereas in a non-fiction book, it's not fiction you can't really imagine, it's just there" [19, F, 06, 05/04/01]. The notion that expository texts cannot be imagined or visualized must be coming from somewhere and I suspect the need for the "right answer" at school may be part of the explanation. There is limited if any negotiation.

Eight of the nine kindergarten students liked rereading stories in school. Although Knute did not respond, the variations in the other children's responses, "sometimes" [Kimberly, 04, F, 21, 05/09/01], "some stories" [Kora, 07, F, 21, 05/15/01] and, "short ones" [Kelly, 02, F, 21, 05/01/01] indicated that there were conditions for the rereading of books in school that were not mentioned about reading at home. It pointed to the notion that the likelihood of any book being the favourite of all the children in the classroom is minimal. Although none of the kindergarteners mentioned the teacher rereading stories, the possibility exists that they may have been referring to the teacher rereading books, whereas that was not the case for the grades two and four. The children in grade four explained that their teacher was reading a book aloud to them for the first time and the data collection was carried out in May of the school year.

More articulate positive responses about rereading stories in school came from seven children in grade two and Fania, Foster, Freya, and Felix in grade four. There were two notable differences from the earlier list concerning rereading books at home [3], reading as an escape was not mentioned nor was reading to learn words.

- "Excitement and sometimes it teaches you" [Tyler, 18, M, 21, 05/10/01].
- By reading it over and over, each time, "it will be completely different" [Tanner, 10, M, 21, 05/07/01].
- Interest [Tully, 17, M, 21, 05/10/01; Freya, 27, F, 21, 05/29/01]
- Anticipation of a good book [Thomasina, 12, F, 21, 05/08/01],
- Appropriate book level [Tulsa, 16, F, 05/08/01],
- Humor [Titus, 13, M, 21, 05/08/01] and
- Predictability [Tor, 14, M, 21, 085/08/01].
- Author and series [Felix, 22, M, 21, 05/11/01; Foster, 25, M, 21, 05/16/01]

So, what makes a book a favourite in school? Areas touched on by the kindergarten children were escape, pictures, and curiosity. Kora liked clay pictures, Kojo preferred color to black and white [08, M, 21, 05/18/01] which supports the work of Samuels, Biesbrock, and Terry (1974). As noted in research by the Children's Literature Research Centre (1996) concerning reasons why children choose books, pictures are a major attraction. In their survey of 8,834 children, 645 of whom were in the four to seven year age range, 68 percent of the girls and 61 percent of boys indicated they chose books based on the illustrations [p. iv, 205]. The researchers at the Centre noted that by the time children are six or seven many have moved on to chapter books and that these too "generally have illustrations throughout" (p. 205). Kelly, as already mentioned, had tried to read a chapter book to her mom. However, there was a distinct difference between the perception of the children

in my study about chapter books and that presented by the Centre. For the children in my study, there was no sense that chapter books are considered another type of picture book or on par with them, but rather that chapter books are a signal of advanced ability and independence in reading. Even though Kelly had given the titles of two books she read over and over at school, she noted that what makes a favorite for her is, "Because you read it, because sometimes your mom reads it to you and you just really like it more than any of your other books" [02, F, 22, 05/04/01]. So the support was seen as coming from home.

Among the grade twos only Tully did not respond to the probe what makes a book a favorite in school. Tanner like Tripp persisted in reading even though he was not always sure of the outcome. The other children's responses are a further explanation of why they reread:

- Significant People – "Because sometimes you get it from your mom and dad or for your birthday or something like that" [Teresa, 11, F, 21, 05/07/01].
- Humour and Genre "Well most of them are funny and also the Hermie one is very interesting because it's a mystery book" [Titus, 13, M, 21, 05/08/01].
- Pictures – [Teresa, 11, F, 21, 05/05/01; Tor, 14, M, 21, 05/08/01; and Tyler, 18, M, 21, 05/10/01].
- Level of a book, "Ah, that you can read it well, that it's at the right level and you really like it" [Thomasina, 12, F, 21, 05/08/01].
- Story – "It's the story that's important." [Thomasina, 12, F, 21, 05/08/01]. "It's usually just the story, how it makes me feel" [Tor, 14, M, 21, 05/08/01].
- Skills and Grades - "Cause it builds on my reading skill and my grades" [Tulsa, 16, F, 21, 05/09/01].

The children's talk indicated that they are and want to be self-directed learners, the third level in the theory of affect. They know enough about themselves in terms of what they value. They value family, they value a good story and they can identify where their weaknesses lie.

The grade fours had conditions for a favorite or stories that would be reread. Although Faith noted that she would only read a favorite maybe "twice," what makes a favorite for her and the others?

- "I find I like surprises the same with adventurous books" [Faith, 19, F, 21, 05/04/01].
- "If it's like a Hardy Boys with its action and mystery and adventure all mixed together, it's like perfect" [Felix, 22, M, 21, 05/11/01].
- "More jokes" [Fania, 20, F, 21, 05/10/01],
- "Cause I like *Silverwing* (Oppel, 1997) cause you know I said I like bats, they're really neat" [Felipe, 21, M 21, 05/11/01].
- "That it's interesting, that it's long and it's what I like" [Ferdinand, 23, M, 21, 05/15/01].
- "The only book I remember reading over and over again was "Harry Potter" but Finlay likes, "a lot of action and sometimes just standing around and talking" [24, M, 21, 05/15/01].
- "Well when you start reading it and you think this is such a good book and I got to keep reading. It's just the action, the story event" [Foster, 25, M, 21, 05/16/01].
- "One reason it would probably have pictures in it" [Frederica, 26, F, 21, 05/22/01].

According to research carried out by the Children's Research Centre (1996) rereading of books met for the first time in school decreases as the children age. There is a need for a distance of time to rebuild anticipation and because of the sheer length of books children read as they age as pointed out by Faith and Ferdinand. However, at what point do children metacognitively

understand that the depth and breath of their vocabularies is to a large extent based upon the amount and quality of their reading?

Vocabulary Development. Only Kimberly in kindergarten appeared to make the connection between reading and knowledge of words and it was very rudimentary, "No, because I don't know how to read yet, but I'm just learned, I'm learning how to read" [*04, F, 28, 05/09/01*]. Our conversation after that statement concerned the book, *Franklin's Class Trip*. (Bourgeois, 1999). I pointed to the title and implied that she knew how to read the name Franklin because she had told me the title, however, she told me point blank, "No, I don't" [*04, F, 28, 05/09/01*] and our conversation turned to spacing between words. Tor, Tripp, Tulsa, and Tyler articulated clearly the connection between knowing a lot of words and the amount of reading that they did. In grade four Freya was the only one who did not verbalize the connection between knowledge of words and the fact that she read a lot. In other words, the fusion of cognition and affect can occur very early in the reading process for some children. Kimberly in kindergarten was metacognitively aware whereas Freya, at that point of questioning, was not. Even when probed about where her knowledge of words came from she replied, "I don't know" [*27, F, 28, 05/29/01*]. Teachers are expected to motivate and support learning on an intrinsic level through the elucidation of word meanings from the time children come to school. Motivating more reading and on a broader range of topics on the part of the children requires a large number of resources written at different levels. This motivation and support was evident more in kindergarten and grade two and less so in the fourth grade.

Resources

There appears to be a contradiction concerning the use of the school library as a resource. As previously noted, when it came to utilizing the school library, it was not until grade four that the children indicated an increased use on a personal basis [18]. The question arises for me, how do children find the means to attain self-direction when it comes to reading school material? I

assumed that they needed the same kind of support given at home for pleasure reading. If they do not get the support, is the effect a decline in school reading as the grades increase? Will there be a parallel increase in negative affect as expressed by the grade four children for school reading, and by some of the younger children? The fact is that not all children like to read the same material or are capable of reading the same material at the same age. I am thinking specifically of expository text. There is usually a range of readership in any classroom, therefore the material that children require would also need to be provided. The expository library resources even in this middle class school were not adequate to fulfill the needs of all the grade four classrooms and teachers. Faith and Fania pointed out that social studies and science were taught through note-taking, implying that there was attention only to right answers and not to the excitement of curiosity and discovery. Satisfying curiosity requires time and a location where one can get into the right frame of mind to mull over and entertain ideas.

Time and Place. Twenty-six children, the exception being Kimberly, reported reading in school. Eight of the kindergarteners, all of the grade two children, and eight of the grade fours responded that they enjoyed reading in school. Frederica, the grade four exception, noted, "Well sometimes it's because its really noisy and everything and everybody is yelling, also, because I don't feel that happy when I'm reading in school." Probed about home she responded, "It's just that I'm more comfortable when I'm at home" [*26, F, 20, 05/22/01*].

Only Kayla, Kennedy, Kimberly, and Kieran in kindergarten and Tanner, Thomasina, Titus, and Tulsa in two reported that they read on their own "everyday" in school [26]. So, although Knute did not answer the question, still almost 50 percent of both groups perceived that they did not read on their own everyday in school. Furthermore, the grade four schedule did not include individual reading time everyday. Interestingly, in grade four it was possible that a child might not read on his/her own during the week if they did not wish to because according to Faith, "We have partners

or, we do it by ourselves" [19, F, 26, 05/04/01]. For Titus in grade two the lack of privacy with a partner might have proven to be a problem, he noted the reason he liked reading on his own four days a week was, "That there is no one there to bug you" [13, M, 26, 05/08/01]. As Teresa pointed out on Thursdays the children were allowed, "to read to other people and stuff, you share a book and you read." The children are allowed to approach each other and ask, "What are you reading?" They are permitted to interrupt other peoples' reading time and space and expected to share by reading aloud from their book. Regarding their regular schedule Teresa explained, "Like there's this purple book you put some things, like the date of the book you are reading and the number of pages you go to and you are given five, ten to twenty minutes to read [11, F, 26, 05/07/01]. In grade two the amount of time for reading each day was inconsistent. According to Tor, Tripp and Tully they were so busy sometimes doing special things on special days they did not have enough time, "Usually it's on a daily basis but sometimes we have a lot of other things to do" [15, M, 26, 05/08/01].

Six of the kindergarten children reported that they would like to read more at school and although Kayla did not respond to the question, Knute liked the status quo. His response was not really surprising as he had already reported that he did not like to read very much. Kelly was not really sure, "Maybe, I don't know, I just sometimes don't feel comfortable at school when I'm reading. I just want to go, [pause] and, [pause] play" [02, F, 20, 05/04/01]. There was a noticeable sadness in the child's tone of voice. Kristy's response showed where she too felt most comfortable and empowered, "I'd like to read more in school so then when I read at home I get better at reading at home than in school" [09, F, 20, 05/23/01].

Whereas six of the grade two children would like more time put aside for reading in school, Teresa, Tully and Tor were satisfied with the status quo but for different reasons, "It would take up time from other things" [11, F, 20, 05/07/01] said Teresa. "No, cause I read a lot at my house" [17, M, 20, 05/10/01] responded Tully, and Tor commented, "Yah, but I'd like to read at home a bit

more cause at home I can read anywhere, downstairs, upstairs, basement, main floor" [14, M, 20, 05/08/01]. He then reminded me that one day a week they can sit anywhere in class and read with friends. Given that their reading schedule is inconsistent it is not surprising that Tulsa and Tanner responded in a similar vein, "I would really like to read more so I can build on my reading" [16, F, 20, 05/08/01] and "To improve my reading" [10, M, 20, 05/08/01].

Felix's comment was an eye-opener, as already noted Frederica [26] was not comfortable reading in school because of the boys yelling. Faith [20] and Ferdinand [26] mentioned noise too but Felix made reference to both lack of time and the loudness of the children in the morning. When probed if he would like to read more in school he responded, "Yah, cause we only have half an hour a day plus sometimes it's too loud to read." Apparently, reading occurred at the beginning of the day, but "After the outdoor bell rings you have five minutes. Then the bell starts for classes and we have to have announcements over the television cause we record messages and that may be long and actually cuts into our other lesson time. Sometimes it's more than fifteen minutes" [22, M, 20, 05/11/01]. Eight of the nine grade four students would like more time set aside for reading. Aside from complaining about the noise, Frederica did not want to read more in school because they "have to read novels" and although they are allowed to choose, "we have to read them out loud" [26, F, 20, 05/22/01]. Knowing her strengths and weaknesses, oral reading in front of classmates was not at the top of her list of pleasurable activities anymore than it was at the top of Thomasina's.

From the children's conversations and my notes (May 29, 2001), the kindergarten children went to the library in the center of the school once a week to change their book; parent volunteers and teachers helped them. Very little time was actually spent reading in the library but there were two sofas and two big chairs for the children to sit on to peruse their chosen book. The library for the grades two and four was also at the center of the school. The library was landscaped in a series of broad carpeted steps and sank down into a room like a sunken living room. There were

comfortable chairs situated throughout the room as well as worktables and chairs. Two-sided, free-standing elementary height book shelves were situated around the room according to Dewey Decimal Numbers and on the perimeter at the entrance to each grade corridor (which contained four classrooms) there stood stands of bookshelves of novels written at that particular grade level. Even the exit corridors had a display of books. The teacher-librarian was generally available and the children were on a flexible schedule for changing books. Each of the classrooms had a well-lit carpeted "cozy-corner" for reading. A whole class of grade four children could not comfortably fit in a "cozy-corner" which is rather like a large walk in closet. Given their expressed time and location needs, do they also require choices in what to read?

Choice. Eight of the kindergarten children responded that they got a choice in what they read in school, Kimberly noted though that she did not always get a choice. Seven of the grade twos reported that they got a choice but Titus and Tyler pointed out they were not allowed to read "I Spy" books during their scheduled silent reading time. However, one day a week they were allowed to share their reading with other students. Teresa preferred not to read books from the school library at all. She wanted time to read her own books. Probed, if that was why she brought her books from home, she agreed, "Yah." She stated, "I don't like going to the [school] library anymore. I don't like going here anymore cause I like to read my own books and I don't have enough time to read them" [11, F, 20, 05/07/01]. Not only choice, but time has arisen again as a need.

Even though the grade two children reported that they got a choice in their reading material, when probed if they did novel study the reaction was not as favorable. Tripp responded, "Yes, in lit circles we do book studies and then we do book reports. We don't study authors we just do lit circles" [15, M, 20, 05/09/01]. There were limited copies of each book, so the children were grouped according to the book they were reading. Probed if they had a choice in what was read in the literature circles, of the explanations provided by Tripp, Tulsa and Tully, Tully's is the best

example, he reported, "Well Ms. [named teacher] says, 'Pick three out of these.' Ms. [named teacher] will put us in groups kind of thing. You get a choice of three. Your first choice is one that you always, truly and faithfully wanted. But if there's too many people love it, you'll just end up with a second" [17, M, 20, 05/10/01].

All nine of the grade four children indicated that they had a choice in what they read in school with the exception again of the literature circles. Foster explained, "We usually make a list of which ones we want and she'll [the teacher] make the decision" [25, M, 20, 05/16/01]. But as already noted by the grade two children, it does not always work out that you get to read something that you want to read. Ferdinand had to wait almost a year to get a book he actually wanted to read. "All lit circles except this one, that's the only reason I got this book was because every single time we had lit circles I didn't get the book I had first chosen, so I told Miss and she said I could get the one I wanted this time." Probed if he wanted to read more in school he responded, "I don't know. I kinda don't read that much" [23, M, 20, 05/15/01]. Choice in what they read grants the children control and a sense of independence in their reading. Both are important aspects of self-direction in that the individual knowing his/her strengths, weaknesses, and values, is free to experiment, organize, and create (Robeck & Wallace, 1990).

Books are not the only medium where the children look for choice. Although all of the children read on the computer in school, not all of them enjoyed it. Not getting a choice in school caused some frustration for Kelly and she thought that the teachers did not care enough to ask. The teachers unknowingly conveyed that reading on the computer did not warrant consideration of the children's choices either. So, the children relied on their resiliency to maintain their own positive affect for reading.

Role of Affect

Even though at the kindergarten level children appeared to have attained a beginning awareness of how to equip themselves with knowledge, still, homework for Kristy was tied to the important people in her life, mom and dad. In grade two, school was definitely implied as a place where they were being given the means to equip themselves with the knowledge that they yearned for. The same could not be said for the grade four children. A noticeable aspect of the British Schools Council survey (Whitehead, Capey, Maddren, & Wellings, 1977) as well as more recent American surveys reported by Kush and Watkins, (1996) and McKenna, Kear and Ellsworth, (1995) is that school reading declined as the grades increased. In my study what might be seen as a disinclination for school reading did not appear to occur until the fourth grade. Some of the children were given an opportunity for personal reading in the library implying an opportunity for self-direction, self-direction with regard to expository reading for curriculum purposes was not afforded the same leeway. The results are more indicative of the findings of Phillips, Norris, Osmond and Maynard (2002) where the categorizations of reading achievement can change and are not immutable. It is the teacher's ability to support and motivate reading and learning that can make a difference. In my study, even though the children did not talk to the teacher, the grade two girls equaled boys in their reading of information books. They found pleasure in finding things out for themselves. How to find information needs to be taught and supported in school. Because affect functions as an influence on interest and ability to stay with the reading task, it helps to guide the cognitive goals and strategies that the children engage in. Positive affect can give children an anticipatory advantage in their chosen genre. Affect transforms children's autonomy. Without positive affect the children's resiliency for reading in school would, I think, be weaker than it appears.

Aspects of the classroom environment in more than one case were not developing and supporting positive affect but rather were developing negative or neutral affect. The children described reading situations in which free choice was often limited and a class reading schedule on which they could not depend, scheduled reading times that did not necessarily bring with them either silence or independent reading, and the unlikelihood of conversations with the teacher about what might interest them in reading. Yet, the children's purposes in reading and rereading books remained constant across the grades even though school did not appear to be doing much for their reading pleasure.

It appears that the teachers in my study were unaware that their actions were noticed by the children or that the children came to school with expectations. Although not generalizable given the size of my study, the implication is that the relationship between the teacher and the children as it plays out in the classroom may be either the beginning of involvement in and engagement with reading and learning or more of a hiatus where school reading is concerned but a continuing personal development with reading.

As they talked with me the children's perceptions of their peers indicated that even in kindergarten some children were not only aware of their peers' preferences and attitudes toward reading but were also affected by them.

Peer Perceptions are Not Neutral

As children grow older, friends and acquaintances as well as family play a role in their reading development (Almasi, 1995, Gee & Green, 1998). Actions and words shape and reshape conceptualizations. While the children realized that boys and girls do read, only six of the children perceived that they actually influenced their peers' reading material and three of the children described being influenced by others when it came to what they read. Although Kennedy said, "I don't know" [03, N, 29, 05/08/01] as to whether or not girls liked to read, there were subtle ways in

which the other children perceived the reading behaviors of their peers. We may like to think that teasing is a thing of the past, three children in grade two and one in grade four admitted that it occurred and that they were negatively affected by it. Reading was an activity generally associated with girls. Reading was something girls liked to do. Also, both boys and girls conceptualized that girls liked to read more than boys liked to read. The proportion of girls' and boys' voices regarding the negative concept of boys reading changed over time to a more negative view by boys. Both girls and boys were at times frustrated by the behaviors of their own and the other gender which is a very strong indication of the role peers play in the social context of reading. Although few talked about what they read with their peers, most knew what their peers were reading or liked to read. Whatever was being read was an indication of the level of maturity and ability of the reader.

Reading as a Social Event with Peers

With the exception of three of the children, peer influence at the kindergarten level did not appear to be strong; their thinking was still very egocentric as Kieran and Kora's responses indicated "Same books as me" [05, M, 31, 05/09/01] and "Easy books like me" [07, F, 31, 05/15/01]. Kimberly provided us with another view; she liked to look at another child's book choices, "Cause I like to see. She gets them first. So I don't pick another book. I just look at [girl's name]'s. She puts it back and I take it" [04, F, 31, 05/09/01]. The teacher stated that Kimberly is a below average reader and the other child is an above average reader. The teacher may be unaware that she is indicating that the former little girl's ability is important and appreciated. Kimberly may perceive that whatever the other girl is reading can help her to learn to read and perhaps improve her teacher's perception of her as well.

At the grade two level only Teresa and Titus stated they have an influence on their friends, Teresa noted, "They read like chapter books like me and books and stuff like that" [11, F, 31, 05/07/01]. Titus pointed out they read, "Mostly my favorites. They'll copy me" [13, M, 31, 05/08/01].

There is the same sense from these children that they are in charge of their reading. Since they are perceived as self-directed, others will see their ability and copy them. Tanner has stated elsewhere [17] that sometimes his friends choose what he reads because he will read books at their suggestion. From grade four, Faith spoke about her best friend, "It torments me to try to read a book I've already read and it is interesting to read the books that she told me to read. Books that I know are going to be good because [names friend] likes good books" [19, F, 32, 05/04/01]. Fania explained, "Sometimes at recess when we don't have anything to do I ask them about their book...so I went to the library and I got it and it turns out to be interesting" [20, F, 32, 05/10/01]. Being self-directed these children appear able to evaluate their own ability and recognize the maturity of their tastes. How Finlay has expressed himself is informative because earlier when explaining about rereading some books and the need to persevere he stated that the reason he actually finished the first Harry Potter was because of his friends. "I don't know why, I was lucky I didn't stop reading it because it is so boring until you get to the last 100 pages. So it was really actually pretty good that I didn't quit it because then I wouldn't have read more. I think I asked my friends a lot too though and they said, 'Oh it gets better,' because all my friends had read it." Probed if this had ever happened before he responded, "Not that I can remember" [24, M, 03, 05/15/01]. So his friends had had an influence on his reading. A good book at the grade four level it seems was an interesting chapter book, not a picture book. As only nine children reported influencing others' reading tastes or being influenced by them, awareness of what others like to read does not really seem to matter a great deal for the majority of the children in my study.

Everybody Reads

Twenty-six of the children believed that their friends did read (Knute did not participate in questions dealing with peers). In all, 15 of the children responded with an unequivocal "Yes" that boys read (nine boys and six girls) and 17 responded in the same manner about girls (seven boys

and ten girls). With the exception of Kelly, Teresa, and Titus who stated that boys did not like to read and Kennedy, who did not know whether girls liked to read, all of the other children employed caveats that indicated that both genders responded using the same positive and negative descriptors about each other when it came to reading.

For example, four boys and four girls applied the following words to describe boys reading,

- "Probably" [Tully, 17, M, 29, 05/10/01; Fania, 20, F, 29, 05/10/01],
- "Not a lot" [Finlay, 24, M, 29, 05/15/01],
- "Not all" [not all boys read] [Felix, 22, M, 29, 05/11/01],
- "Some" [Faith, 19, F, 29, 05/04/01; Freya, 27, F, 29, 05/29/01], and
- "Sometimes" [Kristy, 09, F, 29, 05/23/01; Foster, 25, M, 29, 05/116/01].

Five boys and two girls modeled a similar pattern to describe girls reading,

- "Probably" [Tor, 14, M, 29, 05/08/01; Ferdinand, 23, M, 29, 05/15/01],
- "Most" [Titus, 13, M, 29, 05/08/01; Tripp, 15, M, 29, 05/09/01],
- "Some" [Freya, 27, F, 29, 05/29/01]
- "Sometimes" [Teresa, 11, F, 29, 05/07/01], and
- "Not sure" [Felix, 22, M, 29, 05/11/01].

So what exactly do they read? As already noted Kieran, Kora, and Kimberly see their friends as reading whatever they read. Although only Kojo and Felipe did not respond to the question, what do your friends read, the children were not always sure though what kinds of books their friends read, as Kelly put it, "Well, I'm not usually watching them when I read, just trying to figure out all the words in my book" [02, F, 31, 05/04/01]. Peer influence, if measured as knowledge of what their friends read, might not affect Tanner, Tripp, Felix, or Finlay given they generally responded they did not know what their friends read. I infer that they see themselves as not really

needing the support of peers in their choices; they see themselves as mature, self-directed readers. Also common among these boys is that they described themselves as above average readers [10]. It is interesting to note that Felix, Finlay, Felipe, and Tripp were considered by their teachers to be above average readers. Although Tripp stated his teacher did not talk about his high reading ability, the results of the TERA-2 and the teacher's judgment confirmed his belief in this regard. Tanner was considered to be an average reader by his teacher but, his results on the TERA-2 place him below average and Kojo judged average by the teacher also showed a below average reading ability on the TERA-2. Kojo's perception of his own reading ability, however, is that he is good.

As for the other children, they are consistent in their awareness of the material their peers read, their responses included:

- Chapter books [Teresa, 11, F, 31, 05/07/01; Thomasina, 12, F, 31, 05/08/01; Freya, 27, F, 31, 05/29/01] and
- Series titles [Thomasina, 12, F, 31, 05/08/01; Titus, 13, M, 31, 05/08/01, Tulsa, 16, F, 31, 05/09/01; Tully, 17, M, 31, 05/10/01; Tyler, 18, M, 31, 05/10/01].
- Author [Thomasina, 12, F, 31, 05/08/01; Tor, 14, M, 31, 05/08/01, Faith, 19, F, 31, 05/04/01].
- Specific Title [20, F, 31, 05/10/01].
- Scary books [Titus, 13, M, 31, 05/08/01],
- Interesting and fun books [Kayla, 01, F, 31, 05/04/01; Tully, 17, M, 31, 05/10/01],
- Adventure books [Ferdinand, 23, M, 31, 05/15/01],
- Comic books [Kristy, 09, F, 31, 05/23/01] and

- Information books. (Information books mentioned by the children involved cats, dogs, puppies, dinosaurs, and animals in the jungle or nature) [Kennedy, 03, M, 31, 05/08/01; Kristy, 09, F, 31, 05/23/01; Frederica, 26, F, 31, 05/22/01].

Being aware of what your friends read does not necessarily entail discussion.

Talking to Your Friends about Reading

Five of the kindergarten children Kayla, Kennedy, Kieran, Kora, and Kristy talked to their friends about reading and three of the children, Kelly, Kimberly, and Kojo did not. Both of these groups of children are of average and below average reading ability based on results from the TERA-2. So ability is not the basis for talking. Those children who do talk to their friends tell them when they think a book is a really good read.

Given that seven of the nine grade two children knew what their friends were reading, you might think they talked about reading. But four of the children, all boys, (Tanner, Titus, Tor and Tripp) from the full range of reading proficiencies stated, "No." Teresa (of average ability) and Tully (of below average reading ability) responded similarly, "Only if they ask me" [11, F, 32, 05/07/01] and "Like when we have nothing to do we do that" [17, M, 32, 05/10/01]. Only Tyler, Thomasina and Tulsa said, "Yes" they talk to their friends. Tulsa provided the best example, "Well some of my friends, I like to talk to them about reading and they really enjoy it because it is something to do with your time, with your free time and that's really good" [16, F, 32, 05/09/01]. The results from the TERA-2 show these three children as having average and below average reading ability. Fewer children (three) in grade two reported talking to their friends about their reading than in kindergarten (five).

Only three of the nine grade four children, Faith, Fania, and Felipe, stated in the affirmative that they talked to their friends about reading. Felipe noted, "Sometimes if it's a fantastic book we talk about it and ask whether they've read it and stuff" [21, M, 32, 05/11/01]. The results of Fania's and Felipe's assessment indicated a below average reading level. Faith was average. Whether they

talk or do not talk to their friends about reading does not appear to be dependent on the children's reading ability, but rather how pleasurable the associations of discussing reading with their classmates are, a good example comes from Kayla, "They're fun sometimes" [01, F, 32, 05/04/01].

Negative Affect

Many of the children's responses about talking to their friends were overshadowed by negative affect. Ferdinand for example explained that, "No, well, if it's like something really funny or something, we'd show it." He went on to say of books, "It's like a side thing." Probed as to what they were interested in he responded, "Hand Hockey" [23, M, 32, 05/15/01]. Finlay stated that he and his friends do not really talk about reading. "Sometimes I'll ask my friends about any good books they've given to me and we'll talk about them after but, it's not really cool to really talk about them a lot" and although he does not know why, he speculated that he would only talk about the interesting or "just a cool part of it" [24, M, 32, 05/15/01]. The cool part seems to be a part that he predicts his friends might have an interest in.

Foster noted, "Not very much. Well it seems like I haven't known very many of my classmates and I really don't talk to them about reading" [25, M, 29, 05/16/01]. I thought perhaps he was new to the school but he responded, "No," apparently he had attended the feeder school. Foster does not appear to trust his classmates. Frederica responded, "No, Sometimes they tell like information... but not usually" [26, F, 32, 05/22/01] and Freya although she responded, "No," carried on with, "Well sometimes we do. Sometimes we say that we're reading a really good book" [27, F, 32, 05/29/01] and she recommended books. The children do not sound comfortable talking with each other about everything they find pleasurable reading. They do seem much more comfortable reading some things at home as Frederica and Kelly have told us. Why? I think even good readers are not always confident among friends, and at times show uncertainty, possibly having to defend their choices, their ability, and even perhaps risk being teased.

Teasing

No children in kindergarten were teased about their reading [30], but surprisingly three grade twos, Teresa, Tulsa and Tyler responded they were teased either at home or in school. Teresa responded, "Sometimes, but I get over it. I just tune them out that's about what my mom says. They don't really tease me anymore that was in grade one. Like there were older boys. There was the boy who got holded back for like a year or two" [11, F, 30, 05/07/01]. Tulsa responded, "No," then added quietly, "My uncle [named] teases me. He says, "You're a bad singer and a dancer and a reader." Probed about her uncle's age, she responded, "He's like 21." Probed for her response to her uncle she replied, "If you can't say anything nice don't say anything" [16, F, 30, 05/09/01]. Tyler was teased by a member of his family too, "My brother" [18, M, 30, 05/10/01]. But there was nothing in Tyler's demeanor to indicate he was upset, for him it appeared to be friendly teasing. Unfortunately, when I talked to Fania about reading at home she brought up her worry that when she stumbles over a word in class that her classmates will make fun of her [12]. She implied that teasing occurs in the grade four classroom as well.

Girls Read More Than Boys

Strangely enough, even in kindergarten, some children responded that girls liked to read more than boys and the strength of the conviction by Kora and Kelly is quite powerful because they described their perceptions from home and school perspectives. As we have seen, it is the family and siblings that seem to provoke a strong response, both negative and positive, from the kindergarten children. A case in point would be Kora's belief, "Because I read more than my dad!" [07, F, 29, 05/04/01] is an indication to her that girls read more than boys read (McKenna, Kear & Ellsworth, 1995). Kelly's response showed that the classroom reading behaviors were also noticed, "Not my brother! Not any boys in my class!" Later she said, "Because mostly all the boys in my class spend time playing not reading books, and mostly all the girls spend time reading and writing

stuff on pieces of paper" [02, F, 29, 05/04/01]. Kelly's perception of her brother may also have influenced her perception of her classmates (Hall & Coles, 1999). Children seem to conclude from the particular to the general.

Kieran provided an explanation from a boy's point of view, "Girls like to read a lot. They like to read everyday, but boys don't like to read that much. But boys like to read at a certain time, like at lunchtime or at breakfast" [05, M, 29, 05/09/01]. He has already stated that he "rememberizes" stories to tell his family at mealtimes [14]. Kristy seemed to confirm Kieran's comment stating nonchalantly, "Boys like to read sometimes" [09, F, 29, 05/23/01]. But, she did not think girls liked to read more than boys liked to read. The children responded from the second level of affect, the level of conceptualization, as they have compared their reading to the reading of others not only in the classroom, but also with their brothers and sisters and even with their parents (Robeck & Wallace, 1990).

Some of the grade twos provided explanations as well. Resounding in gendered beliefs, Teresa said of boys, "No, because they mostly want to play and stuff." Girls like to read, "Sometimes." Queried if it was different, she said, "Yah, different from boys cause boys are tougher and girls aren't" [11, F, 29, 05/07/01]. Titus responded about boys, "No, not really, because they just think it's boring and they want to play." Probed if girls liked to read, he responded, "Most of them, my sister doesn't." Why did he think girls liked to read? "Because it's interesting for them" [13, M, 29, 05/08/01]. Tripp responded, "Most girls are pretty good about reading but some are picky. I mean, you know, they don't really like it too much" [15, M, 29, 05/08/01]. Tully said, "Boys probably like to read and girls, "Yes." Probed as to why he made the comment about boys he responded, "Yah like if they're into just one specific kind of thing. They will read just one specific thing. Like if there's a bunch of books out there they like they'll just read those" and when asked whether girls are not like that? He responded, "They'll just read any kind of book that's interesting" [17, M, 29, 05/10/01]. Tully is

not the first child to say that if boys are into one specific kind of thing that is all they are willing to read. Recall Tripp and the Animorph series, "I don't want to read any other books unless I'm at school" [15, M, 06, 05/08/01]. Tyler reported that boys liked to watch television but girls do not, they read books. Thomasina, who thinks girls read more, provided an interesting explanation, "Mostly, there's more girl books than boys sometimes." Probed if she thought this was true just of the classroom library or in general, she responded, "Just generally" [12, F, 29, 05/08/01].

Faith, in grade four, responded with an impassioned, "No!" when asked if she thought boys liked to read. Then she clarified, "Well some boys like to read but, I think the average is girls like reading more. Girls read more than boys" [19, F, 29, 05/04/01]. Fania responded that boys, "Probably" like to read and girls, "Yes, that I know for sure." She carried on, "I think they (boys) like to read a specific kind of book like about aliens or things because boys are really into action and things. Girls read as well. How I like to read is funny books, and happy books, and sad books and mad books and things" [20, F, 29, 05/10/01]. Felipe responded, "It does seem like that to me because generally they're better readers, most of the girls in my class" [21, M, 29, 05/11/01]. Finlay explained, "I think girls read more than boys" [24, M, 29, 05/15/01]. Foster's response was, "Girls, all the time! I think girls read more than boys" [25, M, 29, 05/16/01]. Based on the children's point of view, it is clear that girls read more and choose to read a broader range of topics than do boys. Boys read specific genres at specific times in specific places.

Other Ways of Being Influenced by Peers

Though the number of girls in each class had increased and the number of boys decreased through transience during the school year, some of the responses from the children when asked if they saw more boys than girls reading were telling because they spoke again about the differences perceived in the boys' reading behaviors. Tulsa is a good example, speaking in an annoyed voice she stated, "No, some of the boys pick, like they copy books like this. Some of them

don't even know how to read them when they pick them. They're not at their level. They probably don't read them because they take them from the library and they take them home." Probed how she would know if they read them or not she noted, "Cause they're not at their level!" Probed if the books the boys were taking home were information books, she responded, "Yes" [16, F, 29, 05/09/01].

Fania reported more girls than boys reading, "Yes, usually when it's SQUIRT time [quiet reading time] I see all the girls reading and most of the boys fooling around with teddy bears and things. We have teddy bears in the cozy corner. I wondered how she could tell if they were not reading. Did they not have a book? She responded, "They have a book with them just that it's sitting on the floor open like that (pointing to the book on the desk) sitting on the floor like that on the page they are reading. So when the teacher comes in, they just put the teddy bear there and pick it up and start reading" [20, F, 29, 05/10/01].

Ferdinand's response is supportive of Fania's description, "Yes, I see more boys reading but, I think girls do more because all the boys in my class read all these boring books like these little picture books. But, some of the boys read good books, not many" [23, M, 29, 05/15/01]. The number of children in grade four (six children - four boys and two girls) who think girls like to read more than boys changed very little from the numbers in kindergarten (five children – one boy and four girls) but, those who held those beliefs changed. Boys seemed to have more confidence in their reading in kindergarten. It appears that the boys have learned they do not like reading as much as girls by the time they have completed grade four. Given the support the boys described being given at home, it is logical to suspect they have learned that they do not like reading in school. It may be a case of self-fulfilling prophecy – if enough people say it, then boys start to believe it.

That girls like to read and that boys like to read, has been expressed clearly by the children but, I suspect that expectations for boys and girls are different in some classrooms and the

difference is reflected in the girls' expressed anger over the laxness of the expectations for boys and the boys' puzzlement that they are not held to the same expectations as the girls. Frederica bemoaned the fact that she must read novels aloud in school [20] and Tripp who reads well perceived that his teacher ignored his ability.

How Boys are Affected

If girls are affected in a particular way by the boys' reading behaviors, for example frustrated, are the boys affected in the same way or differently? Is it simply that boys have different reading appetites and/or preferences to those of girls? As noted earlier Tulsa was annoyed that boys take home books she firmly stated they are unable to read. Faith was quite emphatic that boys do not like to read. Fania too seemed puzzled that they play at the same time they are supposed to be reading and Teresa stated clearly that they prefer playing to reading. Kora and Kelly were also quite firm in their negative view of boys reading. Some boys hold the same views. How does the expectation that boys do not like to read affect the boys?

Felipe, for instance, who does talk to his friends about reading, will read "before" a sleepover. He will not bring a book with him [15]. Felix on the other hand noted, "I really like to read but I don't know about some of my other friends. Some of them like to read but some of them don't." When probed if he saw more boys reading than girls, he responded like Kelly, "I don't look around when I read. I'm usually the first one reading" [22, M, 29, 05/11/01]. So, although he is pretty sure his friends read, he is not sure what they read. Ferdinand does not know why but he thinks girls probably like to read more than boys. Foster, who noted that all his friends read though he does not talk to them very much about what they read, stated they read, "Harry Potter books, all kinds of books like information books but, not the picture books. *I don't use those*." Probed if it was because he was in grade four he responded in a voice and manner that left no doubt of his view of his own personal reading ability and his perception of the level at which his peers should be

reading as well, "Yah, grade four is a new level. Like when you are in grade two you'll read all the easy books. Coming into grade three you'll start to read harder books and when you reach grade four you're almost at the hard, hard, hard, books." Probed that he no longer needed picture books he responded, "That was a long long time ago" [25, M, 31, 05/16/01]. Both the grade two and the grade four boys see girls as reading more broadly and more often and even though some of the boys feel a sense of ability and maturity in their reading tastes, both boys and girls are puzzled by boys not reading more and better books. I speculate that what the children read does matter.

Faith's response is a good example of another reading behavior which may be exhibited by males and females that had been noticed by peers, "Umh, most of my friends read these kind of books [holds up *The Witches* by Roald Dahl]. They like Roald Dahl. But some, some are at the highest level and they don't really, some of my friends they don't finish the book! They just get into it at the beginning and if they don't like it they read another book. They read more books but they don't finish the books" [19, F, 31, 05/04/01]! Given her disdain for boys reading, basically that most of them do not read, I suspect she may well be speaking only about how girls read. Hall and Coles (1999) in their study described the occurrence of girls beginning but not finishing books. Is it possible that teachers and boys believe that girls read more because they are seen reading a larger number of *titles*?

All of the children perceived that their peers read. However, both boys and girls reported the perception that girls read more than boys. Girls, according to some children, are better readers because they spend more time reading, they read a broader variety of books and those books are better books, chapter books not picture books. By grade four some of the boys implied that talking about books was not cool. I think that the boys who think they read well feel anxious about their male peers' less than obvious aim to become better at reading and these good readers experience reading anxiety for different reasons than do the girls. It seems they do not give up on reading; they

just do not talk about reading in school unless it has entertainment value. Felipe noted that he does not talk about reading to his friends at home either. I am still left with the thought that the anxiety stems from others' perceptions of their ability and the girlishness of time spent reading and not "playing". One reason for not talking about reading that crosses gender lines is teasing. When I listened to Foster say, "Well it seems like I haven't known very many of my classmates..." [25, M, 29, 05/16/01], I thought, these children have gone to school with him since he started school. My sense was that he did not trust them not to tease him. It was also interesting to note that the girls said that they did not talk to their friends about books, unless they were asked. I suspect if you are a girl like Frederica and still reading picture books in grade four you would not think about bringing them to school. If you are a boy and you read well and you like reading, you are stuck between a rock and a hard place in the classroom as well, because boys are not supposed to like reading! It appears that there is a double standard held by teachers for reading between the genders. The cost to both groups of children is likely to be negative affect and possibly initiation into aliteracy. Certainly a dislike for school reading seemed apparent from earlier discussions with the children. From the children's responses regarding school and peers, it seemed that in either case some children did hide their reading pleasure from both their classmates and their teachers.

Yet, pleasure is a function of reading. All 27 of the children stated in response to why they read that they read [8] for pleasure. Asked the question, what is reading, they described the functions of reading or what they expected reading to do for them: educate, soothe, stimulate, be artistic, be a hobby, entertain, and relieve boredom.

Pleasure is a Function of Reading

The responses to the final question on the CARP, "what is reading?" paralleled the children's responses to their perception of why they read [8], what is their favorite book [2] and why they reread [3]. They described reading as a pleasurable activity revolving around books and

people and knowing words. That they understood reading to be the construction of meaning comes through in their descriptions of the strategies they used in their search for understanding. The children's articulations of what reading is became more lucid and unambiguous with each higher grade and for that reason their responses are presented by grade. Their understanding of what reading is evolves as they grow in their understanding of and experience with reading.

Kindergarten

Only two kindergarten children, Kayla and Kojo, did not attempt a response to the question, "what is reading?" Kayla's earlier response to why she reads was, "Cause, I like it. It makes me happy. Rainbow fish, he's a rainbow and he has nice scales" [01, F, 08, 05/04/01]. She was very conscious of the texture and color in her storybooks. Kojo, who is read to by his brothers responded, "I like to make people happy" [08, M, 08, 05/18/01]. "Reading is reading. Reading is about books. Reading is about different things," said Kennedy who knows what his baby brother and his cousins like to read [03, M, 05/08/01]. Kimberly responded, "I just look at the pictures and then I stop reading and then I just look at the pictures and I start reading" [04, F, 05/09/01]. Kimberly is describing where she is in the process of learning to read, reading pictures and reading aloud.

Kieran explained, "Some books only have to deal with their selves" by which he meant, "Like some books can even just come with nothing". He does not like reading when the book is all he has to stimulate his imagination: "Reading is something you can do whenever you want and reading is really fun. Reading is something that's all about something and reading is like, reading is something that goes with a movie, or a puppet or a toy or a tape." Asked if he liked a book coming with nothing, Kieran responded, "Well yah, I like that but, not really. If it comes with a toy then it's really, really, really good that I'm reading a book! " [05, M. 05/09/01].

"Reading is kind of like talking but you are reading a story," said Knute [06, M, 05/11/01]. I inferred that he meant engaging with the content and understanding the characters. Knute was

also very conscious of his miscues in oral reading. Kora noted, "I don't know what reading is quite yet. I'm thinking it's just words" [07, F, 05/15/01]. She liked to read easy books, "Reading is your favorite book. Well, you get to check out books and then you read them and stuff can be like that" [09, F, 05/23/01]. Kristy's favorite book is a book she owns. She has already explained that she does not usually get her books from school, so her notion of reading is intertwined with the place where she likes to choose her books, the public library [18]. Kelly spoke in response to a comment I made about how some people like reading and others do not like it at all; sometimes not enjoying it because they do not understand the words. Kelly jumped in and said, "That's called my little sister. What she really likes to do is called playing. She doesn't get it, like, that's why she only gets one or two words because she doesn't try over and over" [02, F, 05/04/01]. Even though she did not think she had an answer to the question, her explanation for what reading is comes through in her description of the persistence of effort to get "the words right."

Responses as to whether or not they had a favorite book [2] and why they reread favorites [3] indicated similarities to the question, "What is reading?" Reading, for Kojo for example, was the medium, the book. When speaking about reading it was in a book. Whether the text was fictional, narrative or expository text, it was held in a book. Kelly, Kayla, Kennedy, and Knute also made reference to reading as engagement with the content. The content could be people, places, events, or things. Kimberly, Kieran and Kristy mentioned reading the illustrations. Kora touched upon reading as words. Kelly specifically mentioned reading as persistence in getting the words right, although persistence showed up in conversation with other kindergarten children (Kieran, Kora, Kristy) elsewhere. There was a sense of purpose in the children's words, even mission in the sense that it was their mission to learn, whether it was to learn to read books or learn about a subject. There was also a sense of enjoyment, contentment and just sheer fun. Reading is what they experience when they read. For Kieran [05, M, 05/09/01], the physical things that seemed to help him

construct meaning or generate ideas from the book were the part of reading that he considered most important. The physical or tactile objects, such as puppets, may help him comprehend both stories and informational text. Perhaps the objects helped him to create images. When Kieran read comics with his dad about the comic hero Spider-man, "He [dad] lifts me up so high, I'm kinda like Spider-man on the wall..." [05, M, 16, 05/09/01]

In other words, reading according to the Kindergarten children seemed to include not only the text; reading included not only the subject matter; reading included the feelings reading evokes and the reading situation itself. Intrinsic to reading was the capacity to provide pleasure in a variety of ways, as satisfaction with oneself for persistence, or as a thrill, as a way to relax, or as a pastime. One more comment from Kieran helped explain how he essentially placed an intrinsic value on books although he did not like them when they were old and dusty.

> When I have, when I have, when I have, when I have a new story book I put it in a safe place first but I feel so excited that I take it out of the place and read it and then when it feels so boring I put it back in the place until the next day and then life goes on and then I forget, I forget it in the place and then I just leave all my special things in the place and I just, I just, I just forget it there and it gets so dusty that my mom sees it there and she just thinks that it's so old that she didn't even read it one time that she thinks that I read it one time but that I didn't read it the rest of the time.

Asked if that was a problem, he responded:

> Yah, it's a little problem but I look through it and then I start to read it and read it because I think, I think when I first see it I forget all about it and I think it just got dusty in the store and I think it's new.

When I spoke with Kieran initially, he mentioned that his favorite book belonged to his dad and the book was an, "Old, old, old, old, old, old, old, old, book" [2] with each word becoming more emphatic each time it was spoken. His least favorite book though was, "One of my dinosaur books, one of my dinosaur books is so old I just don't want to have it" [2]. Probed if it was not a new book, he explained that although not torn, "It's kind of dusty" [2]. He commented that he liked to read his favorite over and over but that when a book starts to get old, "I don't really want it anymore" [3]. Kieran liked new things. He described why he liked to read his favorite over and over, "Oh it's pretty exciting because when I get a new thing or toy or craft thing or statue or bar of soap or book I always want to do something with it before I even think about it. Because it's so interesting when you get a new thing and you just want to play with it." I probed, "So when you get new things, is the newest thing your favorite for a while?" Kieran responded, "Yah, but when it starts to get old I don't really want it anymore." [3]. Dust seems to be a problem for Kieran and his mother when it comes to reading. Dust for her indicates he has not read a book in a long time. Dust to him indicates an old book even though that may not necessarily be the case. For Kieran, it seems that he has to find pleasure in the reading situation in order to read.

According to the theory of affect, Kieran should have been avoiding reading. After all, his mom, a powerful role model, got upset with him. To avoid her anger he understandably should have replaced reading with an activity that was more pleasurable (Robeck & Wallace, 1990). Kieran's mom inadvertently created a situation where books were associated with negative affect. Perhaps Kieran felt conflicted at times because his favorite book was so old and it belonged to his dad. Kieran is a good example of how positive affect, feelings of interest, excitement, and enjoyment, indicated by his appreciation of reading situations with his dad, brother, and younger sister, led him to read and to return to reading again and again (Pulver, 1999).

Izard (2000) pointed out, "psychologists generally recognize that affect can be causal and that it influences perception, cognition and behavioural action" (p. 88). Kieran might never pick up a book if his mother continually represented books as dust collectors and there was no one else to show him the pleasures of reading. In my study affect and cognition are seen as working together. Over time Kieran had come to recognize his mother's discontent and had connected some of his emotions and reactions to her actions (Oatley & Nundy, 1996). He had reached a level of conceptualization and had gone beyond it to self-regulate to read again, to persevere in learning to read. Resiliency is not only to be found in older children but in emergent readers as well.

Grade Two

All nine of the grade two children responded to the question what is reading? Five children Titus, Tor, Tully, Tyler, and Thomasina connected reading with words and finding out what the words say. Tanner, Teresa, and Tripp referred to reading as a social and entertaining event and for Tulsa reading was a skill. Are the children telling us that pleasure is a function of reading?

Titus responded, "I don't know. It is all these words that are put together into sentences that turn into a big story" [13, M, 05/08/01]. Tor, who enjoys reading about how things work, said "Reading is trying to... reading is learning things and just reading a book, reading is looking at a whole bunch of words and trying to figure out what they say" [14, M, 05/08/01]. Tully, who had been puzzled by the fact that his parents did not read to him and who does not talk to his friends about reading, explained, "Reading is like figuring out words, looking at pictures pretty much" [17, M, 05/10/01]. Tyler, who learned to read in preschool, focused his explanation on words, "It is where you get a piece of paper and it has on it these little shapes and certain shapes make certain sounds and certain shapes together make certain sounds. Like the shape "p" and the letter "a", they make the sound "pah". Reading is like where you take a piece of paper and it has on it pictures and you start reading." I repeated, "You start reading the pictures" and in response Tyler

showed me what he was talking about. He was pointing to the letters, not the pictures. He noted, "You start reading the shapes to make certain sounds and that's what reading is," he stated in a very excited voice [18, M, 05/10/01]. Thomasina stated, "When you look at a book and you see words and you read them, the things people wrote and sometimes you can hear them if it is on tape" [12, F, 05/08/01].

Tanner said, "It's fun. Kids love reading. Adults love reading. It's knowledge. It's fun. It's like a stage of growing up. It's when you grow a circle of reading. Like it's like a circle and when the circle gets bigger and bigger each time you grow smarter and smarter in reading and you know harder words and you can read bigger books and bigger books and then you'll like love books. You'll love books! You can make stuff and one day you might do something that you could read about and it might give you a really good idea and then it could help you do something, like help people" [10, M, 05/07/01]! Teresa, her own best supporter, responded, "Well it's like when you want to read, you read and sometimes you like to read to friends and that kind of stuff" [11, F, 05/07/01]. Tripp responded, "It's partly a way to learn, it's partly a way to have fun. It's a way to have fun. Kids need to do it as much as adults" [15, M, 05/08/01]. Tulsa answered, "Reading is when you read a book and build on your skills. Reading is when you enjoy a book and you read it" [16, F, 05/09/01].

In the voices of the Grade two children in my study we hear joy, enjoyment, interest and excitement. Tyler, Tanner and Tulsa are the best examples of the anticipation of reading. Although Tulsa has described her anger (about boys' reading habits) and distress (about being teased) the emphasis on skill described did not detract from the reading event because for her satisfaction in developing her skill was part of her reading pleasure. Titus, Tor, Tully, and Tripp articulated the connection between reading and the search for understanding. For Teresa the social aspect of reading is important, her friends are involved in her description of reading. The children have described how affect and cognition work together (Ruddell & Unrau, 1994). Positive reading

experiences provide the motivation to continue to experience the pleasure gained in the activity. The physical aspects count, the pictures and the letters are important to the children's engagement in the reading process as well (Mathewson, 1976). They help children to construct images and gain understanding. The children associated reading with pleasure being both fun and a satisfying way to learn. You can hear what other people have to say. You anticipate coming to understand what someone else has written. Two descriptions I found striking were Tyler's depiction of the words as pictures and Tanner's description that reading was like "a stage of growing up" [10, M, 05/07/01]. The positive affect of interest, excitement and enjoyment activate and guide the interpretation of the words. Positive affect also motivates the children to persevere to the point that they gain independence and autonomy and can offer something new to another reader, as Tripp said, "Kids need to do it as much as adults" [15, M, 05/08/01]. The attainment of self-direction in reading seems to free the children to be intrinsically motivated. It empowers their awareness on all three affective levels, association, conceptualization, and self-direction (Robeck & Wallace, 1990).

Grade Four

Only one child in grade four, Ferdinand, after reflecting for some time was not able to give his interpretation of the question, "what is reading?" Despite the fact that he sees himself as a good reader and is a keen observer of his fellow classmates' reading habits, Ferdinand responded, "I don't know....Don't know" [23, M, 05/15/01]. Earlier in response to, "why do you read?" he had provided a number of reasons starting with pleasure, "Like it, have to, better than watching TV or something, educational, I don't know." His final response was, "I want it" [23, M, 08, 05/15/01]. Faith described reading as, "Well it's a lot of things. It's education. It helps you in a lot of things. It's identification. If you're writing an e-mail you have to know how to read e-mail, so it's communication. It's fun to read just fiction books first and books from just about anything. It gives you a stronger opinion of things" [19, F, 05/04/01]. Fania focused on escape, "When I'm...reading is

nice to me. When I am mad with my sisters I would go up to my room and start reading and so then I'd fall asleep or I'd keep on reading and reading and reading till lunch or till supper and then finally I'd stop being mad at them and so I could go down and enjoy myself and that's how reading is to me, it soothes me" [20, F, 05/10/01]. Frederica saw reading as, "Saying words out loud" [26, F, 05/22/01] and Freya described it as, "Stuff to do and when you have nothing to do you can read letters and stuff, letters and sometimes numbers. " Probed to expand on letters and numbers she explained, "They become words and some can become big words and some can become very small words like "a", ah so reading is ah.... (long pause), I don't know" [27, F, 05/29/01].

Felipe explained, "Everything. You look around the offices and stuff, like here, you pretty much everything you see has words on it." Probed again for "what is reading," he responded, "A pastime or something to do that I enjoy. It's not my favorite pastime." Probed for what that might be, he continued, "I don't know. There's ones I like better. I like going on the computer and I like playing at friends' houses" [21, M, 05/11/01]. Felix saw reading as, "It's really a hobby. It's hard to explain. It's just like, you learn things about real life because so many books that you read also have information. Like in lit circles books that we read" [22, M, 05/11/01]. For Finlay reading meant, "I find it something actually like TV, except we read. So, it's just something to entertain me, that's pretty much what I think of it" [24, M, 05/15/01]. Foster's response was, "Reading is kind of an art. Like ah, like a picture in my mind of what's happening, like an art of reading, like a new beginning each time you read" [25, M, 05/16/01].

On the one hand, looking at our conversations where we discussed why they read [08], with the exception of Felipe, (who implied it made you smart), the grade four students' first reason for reading was pleasure. On the other hand, the first response each child made in reaction to, what is reading did not refer to reading as pleasure or as a favorite activity but rather implied other functions. The functions of reading being used by the children describe what reading is or can be:

- Education [Faith, 19, F, 05/04/01],
- Soothing [Fania, 20, F, 05/10/01],
- Everything (stimulating) [Felipe, 21, M, 05/11/01],
- Hobby [Felix, 22, M, 05/11/01],
- Entertaining [Finlay, 24, M, 05/15/01],
- Art [Foster, 25, M, 05/16/01],
- Saying words out loud [Frederica, 26, F, 05/22/01], and
- Stuff to do when there is nothing to do [Freya, 27, F, 05/29/01], in other words relief from boredom.

Reading as the children in my study have described it is both a cognitive and a social process involving texts. Affect includes emotion and feelings, attitudes and beliefs in response to and toward reading and affect includes those participating in the reading experiences. Kieran has shown how affect leads to and follows from reading. The children described their expectation that reading is supposed to educate, soothe, entertain, be artistic, make sense, and relieve boredom. I suggest first and foremost that the function of reading, based on the children's responses, was to initiate and is initiated by "interest-excitement, enjoyment-joy" or what we know to be aspects of positive affect (Pulver, 1999).

Looking back over each of the five themes, the dynamic role of positive affect in reading development; home support is fundamental to positive association and negotiation; children are vulnerable to classroom situations and teacher control; peer perceptions are not neutral; and pleasure is a function of reading, it seems that by grade four there is a difference between public and private reading pleasure and that reading for school and in school does not always seem to have the same intrinsic value for the children. The children in general did not want to be questioned

about what they read nor did they share spontaneously with their friends in school, it was a private activity for them. Reading for school and in school was described for the most part without excitement and in negative terms to the point of wanting to leave the classroom.

Differences between the two genders is discussed next, followed by reading achievement as perceived by the teacher and as demonstrated by performance on the TERA-2.

Gender

When the children's responses were at odds with each other, gender emerged as a factor in those differences as well as when themes appeared to be pervasive. The boys and girls perceived significant others including parents, siblings, teachers, and peers as influencing their access to reading in terms of time and resources. In kindergarten, the girls wanted the teacher's attention. In grade two, boredom emerged as a strong theme among the boys, in grade four boys described being strongly supported in their reading by their moms.

Kindergarten

My study does not show many differences between boys and girls at the kindergarten level but where they differ they are striking. The girls showed signs of being vulnerable to their teacher's lack of interest. They were puzzled and perturbed that the teacher did not ask them questions. From the children's point of view, it was the boys who perceived that the teacher was interested in their reading because she asked them questions; the girls perceived that the teacher was not interested in their reading. Phillips, Norris, Osmond, and Maynard (2002) noted, "Teachers need to be more aware of the sources of differences between boys and girls and to not preferentially favor either boys or girls" (p. 5). All children need positive support of their learning; otherwise, their learning expectations may remain unfulfilled.

It could be that the teacher was presuming that the girls were better readers and did not need to be questioned. Kayla provided a possible clue; the children keep a log book in which they

put, "Pictures and the title" [01, F, 25, 05/04/01]. So, because the teacher had a record of what they had read was there any need to discuss with them what they read? The mere fact that what they read was listed in a book makes children accountable and they are fully cognizant of that accountability. They knew they were being evaluated.

Unlike the girls, three of the four kindergarten boys stated they read to make others happy. Basically they read to their younger siblings but they were each very strong in their wanting to learn to read and show others how well they read. Reading to their younger siblings allowed them reader control, a chance to demonstrate what they could do and thus in return they experienced positive affect.

Even in kindergarten, one-third of the children did not talk to their friends about reading, in this case all three are girls. It would appear that they did not necessarily want the attention of their peers but instead showed a need for attention from the teacher. Kelly told us that she saw girls reading and writing and passing notes and that the boys liked to play, so does that mean that the boys were likely to be in the water center, the sand center, or the house rather than at the book display, the listening center or the boxes of writing supplies (paper, markers, and scissors)? Were there different expectations for boys and girls on the part of the teacher? At all three grades, (kindergarten, grades two and four) the link between boys and play was made by both the girls and boys. Boys were seen by others as preferring play over reading even though that is not reflected in the boys' responses.

At first glance it would seem that there was a typical bias shown by the kindergarten boys in their choice of non-fiction as Kennedy, Knute and Kieran responded they liked various subject matter. The girls mentioned story book titles only [1] (Barrs, 1994). However, when responding to whether they liked storybooks [22] all of the children of both genders responded affirmatively, four of the boys and four of the girls liked information books [23]. For someone like Kora who was not

allowed to buy, or to bring home from school books on subjects like sharks, which were not approved of by her mom, then the reading of informational texts was circumscribed.

The Children's Literature Research Centre (1996) reported that the reason they did not find a bias towards boys about reading information books was that the boys lacked the ability to read them and the girls did read them, "Probably because of girls' generally superior reading skills, which enable them to cope with material which might be beyond a good many boys in KS1" [ages four to seven years] (p. 215). There may be a bit of a misperception that girls 'naturally' read. Such a misperception may lead teachers to pay more positive attention to boys and less attention to girls, thereby not supporting the girls' need to talk about what they read. It is well known that boys get more attention than girls in the classroom (Brophy & Good, 1970; Palardy, 1969; 1998).

When it came to daily reading in school, it was three girls Kelly, Kristy and Kimberly who reported that it was not a regular activity. Both time and access to reading material appeared to be gender issues at the kindergarten level. Another area of difference between the genders appeared in their perceptions of the task of reading. Three girls in kindergarten, Kora, Kelly and Kayla as opposed to only one boy Knute, thought it was more important to get the words right when reading rather than to understand the story [9].

Grade Two

Unfortunately, the themes that emerged from the grade twos' responses are evidence of children developing negative affect toward school reading. With affect seen as motivational, the positive motivation to continue to read does not appear in this instance to come from school but from home. Two of the children, both Thomasina and Tulsa, may have had difficulty in actively mastering the school reading environment. Thomasina worried about reading aloud in school because of the teacher's influence and Tulsa was always aware of the level of the books she and others around her were reading. Tulsa seemed to be constantly judging who was in her league.

Tor, Tripp, and Teresa reported that the teacher was not interested in their reading and where both genders were in agreement was they did not want the teacher asking questions about what gave them reading pleasure. To be questioned by the teacher was to be evaluated. Their affective concepts of reading in school indicated private reading time could not be counted upon consistently and public reading could be negative. Creative self-direction with regard to reading in the grade two classroom required a strong sense of self-worth, including ability and a love of reading. By grade two it was important among the children that they not be asked questions but rather, that the teacher acknowledge their reading and help them maintain their positive self-image.

Within the theory of affect, at the conceptual level, reading more and with increasing proficiency maintains positive self-image which is reflected through verbal and non-verbal feedback by others. It would seem for two of the girls that the verbal feedback from the teacher was not positive enough to improve their self-image of their reading ability in school. Teresa, for example, had a strong sense of her growing ability to read, she believed it had been attained without verbal support from either home or school, although it is important to remember that she was still being read to at home by her parents.

As noted elsewhere, Wallace and Robeck (1990) wrote, "Children must feel the self-mastery of the printed page at some level in order to make the transition to read for their own self-directed purposes" (p. 38). The children described self-mastery of reading at home but Thomasina and Tulsa did not experience self-mastery of reading at school. The theory of affect as proposed by Robeck and Wallace thus far does not make accommodation for two mental and physical spaces, school and home, where the children feel one way about reading at home and another way in school. For example, the social aspect of the school reading event was negative for all three girls. Among the boys, Tor although he does not avoid reading altogether, keeps his books at home. Two-thirds of the children, both boys and girls, would have liked to read more in school but they did

not want to be asked questions about what they read. There appeared to be a strong sense of power and control over the children on the part of the teacher in the classroom. The theory of reading affect has to be extended to include those who are involved in the reading event inclusive of the actual process of learning words and ideas and constructing meaning. A significant person can support or detract from children's reading affect, making it positive, negative or neutral. The teacher in this case was significant. Providing positive verbal support to some children and modeling reading strategies known to help children read books at their level, the teacher was unfortunately not providing positive verbal support to "all" the children. It seemed the reading methodology had become more important than the children's interests. The children were unwilling to challenge themselves by taking a risk in light of their interests. They were stuck in a methodological rut. They needed more motivation.

Finally, the theme of boredom arose strongly at the grade two level. Greaney and Neuman (1990) conducted two studies and researched the functions of reading from a cross-cultural perspective. Their analysis of the data was presented with reference to age. For example, from their first reported study they noted that the function of reading most identified by eight-year-olds was enjoyment, followed by reading to learn new things. The ten-year-olds mostly identified learning, then enjoyment but also identified reading as stimulating. Most of the thirteen-year-olds, from 10 out of 13 countries, equated reading with learning. Three countries in particular where reading was cited by the thirteen-year-olds as a way to avoid boredom were Canada, Panama and the United States (pp. 177, 179). Although my sample is small in comparison with Greaney and Neuman's numbers (1,216 in Study One), I have included the breakdown of functions described by the students in my study at the grade two level, looking not only at age but also at gender [08]. Teresa, Tulsa, Tully, and Tanner mentioned enjoyment first. It was the only function that Tully mentioned. Tyler, Titus, and Tripp's descriptions, on the other hand, dealt first with the function of

relief of boredom. Thomasina and Tor mentioned first how convenient it was for them to read, for example, Thomasina read when she did not have to play piano and Tor because he was good at it. Thomasina then mentioned she could read to her friends. Tripp, Tor, and Tulsa mentioned general learning second. Tyler and Tanner mentioned goals second. Teresa mentioned relief of boredom second. Titus mentioned enjoyment second. Tor mentioned relief of boredom third, Tulsa mentioned utility, and Tanner general learning. Mentioned fourth by Tor was enjoyment. Just as with Greaney and Neuman's group of children aged eight, more of the grade twos responded that they read for enjoyment. Unlike their study, the function most mentioned next in my study was relief of boredom followed by reading to learn. Notice that relief of boredom was registered in all by four boys and only one girl.

Grade Four

The family, specifically "Mom" continued to provide significant support especially for the grade four boys, whereas girls expressed a need for home, teacher, and peer support. A stronger showing for the reading of information books by the boys was not atypical, and even though girls were more likely to reread books in school than the boys, what may be atypical was that the boys were utilizing more strategies than the girls during reading, thereby significantly improving their ability. Noticeable among both the grade two and the grade four boys was that they described using more strategies, sound it out, ask someone, skip it, read on, and rereading. But also four of the five grade four boys, Felipe, Felix, Ferdinand, and Foster described using the same strategy, rereading [11]. Among the girls only Faith described three reading strategies one of which was rereading, Fania and Freya described only one each, syllabication and sounding out respectively. Frederica will sound it out or ask someone. Given that the boys used more strategies, it is also of note that Felix, Ferdinand and Finlay's reading achievement levels indicated they were above average readers. Unfortunately, none of the girls achieved above average reading achievement

levels indicating the worth of the boys' diligence and diversity. Although girls were perceived as reading from a broader range of books and reading at a higher level, they did not appear to appreciate expository text. It was the boys that may indeed be attaining further pleasure from the task so that they see reading through a veil of positive affect which is further evidence that both genders are not necessarily being given the same access to a love of reading in this case. Certainly there were more boys showing higher reading proficiency levels. I speculate from their conversations that they were being given more attention and were being asked to reread by their moms when they did not understand what they were reading and it was that relationship that was more positive in its support of their reading than the one they experienced in school.

In the next section, Reading Achievement, the results of the TERA-2 will be presented and analyzed in light of the discussion thus far on the five themes and gender.

Reading Achievement

This section presents the children's reading achievement results of the TERA-2 at kindergarten, grades two and four. The TERA-2 provides a measure of children's ability to read. It includes their knowledge of the alphabet and understanding of print concepts and utilizes pictures, letters, words, sentences and paragraphs. Teachers' and children's personal perceptions are also included as well as possible explanations for similarities and differences that occurred. Where the achievement results and the teachers' judgment were on par the names of the children are made bolder in the tables for the sake of clarity.

Kindergarten

In the previous chapter under the section, *Participants*, it was noted in order to have a range of achievement levels from the teachers' perspective, the teachers were asked to choose children with below average, average, and above average reading ability for inclusion in my sample. Although the original composition of the groups at each grade identified by the teachers

began with three children at each achievement level, the final composition of the groups changed due to parent and child refusals to participate.

All of the kindergarteners saw themselves as good readers which,, as Chapman and Tunmer (1995) have reported, is not uncommon for children at this level of schooling. Table 2, however, provides a breakdown of the differences between the results of the kindergarten children's reading proficiency scores and the teacher's judgment of their reading ability. As Table 2 indicates, the kindergarten teacher's judgment of the children's reading proficiency differed in some cases from actual test results. The different judgment on the part of the teacher may indicate that teacher "observation and intuition" are unreliable due to what has been referred to as "teacher expectation and bias" (Reid, Hresko and Hammill, 1989, p. 6). That the test itself could be at fault seems unlikely given both its known reliability and validity. I have given the TERA-2 on previous occasions and so was familiar with the test—which is not to say it was error free. Testing situations of any kind can be off-putting for some children, although I did not note any evident anxiety at the

Table 2

Teacher judgment of reading ability of kindergarten students by gender and percentile range they obtained on the TERA-2

Teacher Judgment	Boys	%ile Range	Girls	%ile Range
Below Average			Kora	>50<90
			Kimberly	>50<90
Average	**Kieran**	>50<90	**Kristy**	>50<90
	Kennedy	>50<90		
	Knute	≥90		
	Kojo	≤50		
Above Average			Kayla	>50<90
			Kelly	≤50

Note: Students whose teacher–judged abilities corresponded to an equivalent percentile range on the TERA–2 are bolded for emphasis.

time of the testing. The children gave every appearance of enjoyment in their participation in the TERA-2 test.

Reid, Hresko and Hammill (1989) wrote, "The TERA-2 was designed to permit examiners to quantify the reading abilities of particular students by comparing their performance with that of their age mates" (p. 6). A possible reason for the teacher's perception of the reading ability of Kelly and Kojo is their age. Both children were older (by as much as a year or as little as four months) than all the others in the kindergarten sample. The children's background's are different in that Kelly went to pre-school and Knute had spent the previous year at home [Parent Consent Form]. Kelly in particular presented herself as a more mature student than some of her fellow classmates. But at 6 years six months her score placed her at the 42nd percentile meaning that 58 percent of the "individuals who took the test during standardization had higher scores" than she did (Reid, Hresko & Hammill, 1989, p. 24). Kojo's score placed him at the 35th percentile. Kojo was six years, three months in age. Vocalizations by children such as Kora with her preference for "easy" material may also have had an effect on the kindergarten teacher. There was no formal testing carried out on the kindergarten's children's reading by the school to the best of my knowledge. So, aside from teacher judgment in the learning to read groups held during the literacy hour, the question that rises is was the teacher basing her judgment on children's actual achievement in reading or her own expectations? Unfortunately, the latter appears to be the case.

Grade Two

Table 3 provides a breakdown of the differences between the results of the grade two children's reading proficiency scores and the teacher's judgment of their reading ability. Note that Teresa the "awesome" average reader is according to her test results just that, average, but not according to her teacher who saw her as below average. Thomasina, who reported that she is a good reader, is also average. Though the teacher sees her as above average and describes her as

a good reader, the teacher has also told Thomasina she cannot read well enough orally in class. So Thomasina may have the impression that when she reads in school the teacher neither expects her to do well, nor to get better. Tulsa's results showed that she was indeed below average, unfortunately her frustration when she compared herself to others [10, 29] and her dependence on the five-finger method [2, 6] indicate she does not believe she can improve. If we look at the differences in the results between where the boys saw themselves, the test results and the teacher's judgment, we find Tully and Tyler saw themselves as good, Titus, Tripp, Tanner, and Tor saw themselves as better than good. The teacher saw Tully as below average, Titus and Tanner as average and Tor, Tyler and Tripp as above average. The actual test results confirmed Tully at below

Table 3

Teacher judgment of reading ability of grade 2 students by gender and percentile range they obtained on the TERA–2

Teacher Judgment	Boys	%ile Range	Girls	%ile Range
Below Average	**Tully**	≤50	Teresa	>50<90
			Tulsa	≤50
Average	Titus	≤50		
	Tanner	≤50		
Above Average	Tor	≤50	Thomasina	>50<90
	Tyler	>50<90		
	Tipp	≥90		

Note: Students whose teacher–judged abilities corresponded to an equivalent percentile range on the TERA–2 are bolded for emphasis.

average, but with him are three other boys. Only Tyler's results indicated he was average and the only person who was in actual fact above average on the standardized scores was Tripp. As already noted with Thomasina, perhaps other children are confused by the teacher's expectations.

They have expectations for themselves and also have to meet the expectations of others or march to the beat of a different drummer.

Further circumstantial evidence for the teacher's inflated judgment of the boys came from the children themselves. Titus's favorite book, for example, was part of a series of mystery books written for those at a beginning grade two level. The book is also known as a beginning novel, consisting of a few chapters, around 74-76 pages in length, and having a large font size. Seeing Titus independently reading books from the series could have led the teacher to believe he was reading at a higher level.

Tor reported that sometimes he blanks out at reading. In responding to why he read, initially he noted that he was a good reader and a strong reader but, "Sometimes on certain books...sometimes even on really easy books, like it says 'off' and I say 'uf' or something. I just do that sometimes. It's just something that happens" [14, M, 08, 0508/01]. Later when describing how he would rate his reading he responded, "Well, as I told you I'm really good at reading but sometimes I just blank out at reading." How he knows he is good is, "Well there are certain words in things that like I can just read, like there are some words that are like really big. Some are small but they are confusing, like tongue-twisters" [14, M, 10, 05/08/01]. So because there is the see-saw perception of his ability perhaps the teacher's judgment sides on the positive. Tanner in responding to how long he had been reading informed me that at some point when he was learning to read he had had to work on his fluency, reading orally with tone and rhythm but, that was then and he was much better now, "I didn't have fluency. I forgot how to use it and then it just came back" [10, M, 05, 05/07/01]. The teacher confirmed his positive opinion (Personal Notes). It would be safe to speculate that the teacher was still concerned that he be able to read with fluency as she had him use the five-finger method when he grabbed a novel off the book rack in the classroom to read to me as he had forgotten his favorite from home.

Once again, there were differences between the results of the students' performance achievement test and the teacher's judgment of the children's reading ability. At grade two, the difference in judgment crossed all three levels of below average, average and above average. For example, three of the children stated that the teacher did not say anything to them in support of their positive beliefs about their reading ability. The reading results showed that Titus, Teresa and Tripp were at the below average, average and above average levels respectively and that the teacher held a different opinion than the actual test results indicated for each of them. Although responses throughout the CARP and Gender indicated that the teacher has negatively affected the children's willingness to read in school, the children reported positive affect toward reading. Similarities and differences emerged between the kindergarteners and the grade twos and the differences appeared again at the grade four level.

Grade Four

The difference between teacher beliefs about children's reading ability and actual testing levels continued to be startling as the grade four results indicated. Previous studies have shown that teacher beliefs or expectations can have a detrimental effect on children's learning and on their grouping placement (Brophy & Good, 1970; Palardy, 1969, 1998; Thomas & Barksdale-Ladd, 1997). Over thirty years have passed since some of the first studies have been completed on the effects of teacher beliefs on children's learning, and yet little has changed.

As to how the children rated their reading, none of the grade fours described themselves as below average, four (Ferdinand, Foster, Frederica, and Freya) said they were, "Average, " three described themselves as "Pretty good" (Faith, Felipe, Finlay), Fania said she was, "Better than average." Felix said he was among one of the "Higher readers." As noted under Gender, all of the boys were told by their moms that they were good readers and both of Fania's parents said she was good. Faith also mentioned both her parents, but Frederica and Freya noted that no family

member asked them about their reading. Six of the children stated or implied that the teacher was not talking to them about their reading (Felix, Ferdinand, Finlay, Frederica, Freya, and Faith).

Did the children have a higher opinion of their reading ability than the teacher had of their ability? Frederica and Freya saw themselves as average, as did the teacher, the TERA-2 results indicated Freya was average but Frederica was below. The below average perception of the teacher and the matching results of the TERA-2 for Fania did not fit her perception of her average reading ability. Felix and Finlay asserted their higher ability, Ferdinand saw himself as average. Faith saw herself as better than average and so did the teacher but her percentile rank on theTERA-2 indicated average proficiency. Luckily Faith did not appear as vulnerable as Thomasina to the discrepancy between her actual level and teacher expected level of ability. I think because the teacher had not said anything to Faith to make her think differently.

In Table 4, note the difference between the teacher's judgment of Frederica, Felipe's and Ferdinand's reading ability and the results of the TERA-2. Perhaps one of the reasons why the teacher judged Frederica to be of average ability was because (as Frederica explained to me) she had come from a grade two class in another school to this grade four class at the beginning of the school year when the family had moved. The teacher confirmed that Frederica was new to the school that year. No further explanation was given about the move to a higher grade.

The reason why the teacher saw Felipe as an above average reader may have been because he appeared to be very self-possessed, in my notes I used the word taciturn, however, I think reserved may be more fitting. Ferdinand's description of his reading relationship with his mom provided a possible explanation not only for the teacher's perception of his lack of reading proficiency but of how easily misconceptions can occur.

Table 4

Teacher judgment of reading ability of grade 4 students by gender and percentile range they obtained on the TERA-2

Teacher Judgment	Boys	%ile Range	Girls	%ile Range
Below Average	Ferdinand	79[a]	**Fania**	≤50
	Foster	≤50		
Average			Frederica	≤50
			Freya	55[a]
Above Average	Felipe	≤50	Faith	55[a]
	Felix	79[a]		
	Finlay	79[a]		

[a] Only one number is given in the range as all students achieved the same score in the average or above average range.
Note: Students whose teacher–judged abilities corresponded to an equivalent percentile range on the TERA–2 are bolded for emphasis.

It would seem that his mom did not believe that he read so he avoided talking to her about reading. When asked to rate his reading ability he responded, "Probably an average reader." Probed how he knew, he responded, "The thing is I can't read reading out loud. I can't read out loud. I feel weird reading out loud. I like reading in my head better. Cause like when you're saying it and trying to sound it out it looks kind of stupid, so, I just like reading it in my head." Probed if he ever read out loud for any reason he responded, "No, sometimes when I'm not reading my mom comes down and I do it." Probed, when your mom is there? His response was, "No, never mind." My response was, "No, no, tell me." He responded in turn, "My mom says I'm never reading when she comes down after ten minutes. She thinks I never read so she doesn't know." I repeated, "She doesn't know that you do?" Ferdinand continued, "At least at night, sometimes in the day." I probed further,

"Do you not want people to know that you read and you do it okay?" Ferdinand, "I don't know". Probed if his teacher says anything he responded, "No" [23, M, 10, 05/15/01].

Note that he has not stopped reading and reflects positive affect toward reading. When probed earlier if how he felt about reading depended on the books he had responded, "No, sometimes. Cause sometimes I feel mad or something I won't read a book... Yah, I usually read but when like I usually don't read when I'm like tired and stuff." [23, M, 06, 05/15/01]. Ferdinand is also one of those children who when he finishes a book will usually start another one [07]. He is also the child who up until the middle of May had not had a single book for literature circle that he actually enjoyed [20]. Also, he stated that information books need pictures but, "For fantasy stuff who needs it," he can picture it himself [24]. It is possible that he is hiding his ability and pleasure in reading not only at home but also at school (Beers, 1996 Part 1; Worthy, 1996b).

I hypothesize that if children do not think their family values reading [19] and they do not read to them because they are busy [16] and their teacher does not support them by either telling them, "You are good" or by asking non-evaluative questions [10, 26], then that leaves only their peers for positive verbal and non-verbal feedback. Unfortunately, Ferdinand has already described some of his peers, "Because all the boys in my class read all these boring books like these little picture books" [29]. How could he talk to them about books, feeling as he does? The possibility now exists that the teacher may have come to believe that he does not like books, so she does not talk to him about books. Given that the children stated that the teacher did not pay attention to their reading, it is less than likely that she has. In any case, Ferdinand does not fit the theory of affect according to Robeck and Wallace (1990); he appears to have received negative or at best neutral messages from home, school and peers and yet he still does not avoid reading. Beers (1996 Part 1) writing about aliteracy noted that junior high school students can become confused about the value of reading if the teacher does not give them time to read or talk to them about what they

read. Worthy (1996b) writing about reluctant readers at the junior high level noted the children's need for teachers to be more knowledgeable about their reading interests so that they do not overreact to their students' lack of interest in class topics seeing the student as not being "focused" (p. 484). A teacher can acknowledge that not everyone in the class is likely to be interested in the same thing. Bintz (1993) noted similar findings among high school students and teachers. Worthy (1996b) noted also that the students needed freedom to read without being questioned or having to report on their reading all the time. It seems that issues raised by children at the junior high level and the high school level are issues of concern to children in the lower grades as well.

Interestingly, positive affect in response to and toward reading has continued through the early years of schooling among the kindergarteners, grade twos and grade fours of my study. There was not a falling off of positive reading affect or a growth in negative reading affect as found in earlier studies when it came to personal reading for pleasure. However, the same cannot be said of school and expository reading; the children, generally after kindergarten, described a dislike in being questioned about their reading and in grade four they described expository reading as a form of textbook reading where one's imagination was not required.

There are a number of issues raised by the children that help to give substance to the findings of Phillips, Norris, Osmond, and Maynard (2002) that children's reading achievement categorization can change over time. First, different teachers are involved with the children as they progress through school, therefore different relationships with teachers are possible. With knowledge of the children's needs as described by the young children in my study, the issues of gender bias, teacher interest, access to reading material, presentation of instructional material, reading strategies, as well as verbal and non-verbal support could change reading affect in a positive direction.

The children's responses about their relationships with teachers at three grades indicated there were differences based on gender. The seeming lack of interest by teachers in children's reading interests, lack of access to time and materials were issues that were shared across all three grades in the study. The reading choice methodology, the unfurling of the fist into the five-finger miscue test used by the grade-two teacher with students had seemingly positive and negative effects. The method appeared to grant independence in being able to make adequate choices of reading material, but at the same time it seemed to confine or stifle risk-taking even when a subject was of interest. So methodologies have to be monitored. The negative reaction to different types of reading material, for example, academic and expository material in grade four was as a result of how teachers presented such material in the classroom. I felt for Ferdinand. Even with having to read material not of his choosing for a year, he was expected to read and write reports on novels and books in the literature circles. Social studies and science both of which could easily have benefited from expanded use of other media was given over to notes to which there were only right answers so that curiosity was stifled. So a balanced program of presentation methods would need to be put in place.

The children reported that boys generally got more teacher support and home support than did the girls and the boys in grade two and grade four reported that they used more strategies when reading for understanding than did the girls. The TERA-2 scores at each grade level indicated that more boys' scores registered in the higher percentiles than girls so the strategies they were using appeared to have positive results. Because girls are seen as capable readers in general, their needs are neither being recognized nor met so that over time it is the boys who are getting verbal and non-verbal support in school and at home. The results for girls may well be, as has been found in the study by Phillips, Norris, Osmond, and Maynard (2002) that more girls over time actually move down in reading achievement levels or remain the same. No girl in my study

achieved at the highest level. With the knowledge that the children have provided, hopefully positive changes can be implemented in classrooms that will increase positive reading affect at school, increase reading proficiency, and create a more balanced relationship among the genders. As boys are already being supported at home, teachers are in a position to indicate that a more balanced support for both genders is needed.

Based on my analysis of the children's responses to the interview questions as well as in light of both gender and reading proficiency, in Chapter Five I will revisit the original questions with which I began this study and use them as the basis for discussion of the pedagogical issues raised for teachers and parents, explore the theoretical considerations and implications, and the overall implications in terms of policy making for educators.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

The purpose of my research as described in chapter one was to understand children's affect in response to and toward reading. Specifically, I wanted to answer the question how could children's articulation of their affective responses at kindergarten and grades two and four inform a theoretical and applied understanding of reading? Further, would children's articulation of their affective responses differ, and if so, how would they differ in relation to: (a) gender, (b) levels of reading proficiency, and (c) grade?

The children described both the positive and the negative effects of dealing with people as part of the reading event as well as the need for the availability of resources such as time, reading materials, and a place to read. The elements that the children described have implications for the theory of reading affect and for schools where theory is applied.

With regard to theory, I will discuss the finding that affect can change or shift depending upon what is being read, who is present at the reading event, and on the reading environment, and I will also show that positive reading affect is highly social. The negative aspects of reading affect need to be more closely researched as they can, paradoxically, have positive as well as negative affects. Furthermore, there is more than one intellectual and physical space in which children read and learn to read and these spaces need to be taken into consideration in the theory of affect.

In terms of practice, there are implications for teachers, teacher educators, and other educational professionals as changes in theory need to be reiterated in practice with teachers new and old. Practice needs to take into account how the teacher can be perceived as supporter and/or evaluator and to teach children that reading is a process, that literature is written in different genres, that strategies for reading genres need to be taught and learned, and that miscues are part of reading. Teachers need to endorse a value for reading by supporting the children through

providing access to time, access to reading material, and choice of reading material in school which will not necessarily have to be reported. Notably, whole class and group work must also take gender and ability into account. Children too, add a lot to practice. Their commitment to improving practice needs to be taken into account as partners in the educational process.

Issues regarding gender included: boys learning in school that they do not like reading and girls having difficulty in figuring out how to get reading right because reading is a performance activity. The children described reading proficiency in terms of boys getting more support in school, boys being under less stress to perform – reading is seen as fun for them, and boys were not being held to the same reading standards as girls. Figures are included in terms of the levels of below average, average, and above average reading achievement for each gender based on the TERA-2 and teacher judgment of ability and there is discussion concerning reading strategies and the effect on children of being read to by parents until they are older. There were differences in the children's perceptions at each grade. In kindergarten the children included ability and content as part of positive reading affect. The grade two boys perceived that reading relieved boredom and the girls that reading was a skill to be practiced and it took time from other activities. The grade fours perceived that reading was meant to provide a range of options for all people, reading was meant to educate, soothe, entertain, be artistic, make sense, and relieve boredom. I turn now to present some of my thoughts on research for the future.

Theoretical Implications of Affect

There is ample evidence in my study that the theory of affect plays out mainly according to the account of Robeck and Wallace (1990). Reading is an activity meant to be associated with pleasure because it is an activity that is repeated over and over again, but only when it is done out of choice, for pleasure. Positive affect is sustained through repeated positive experiences. The most noticeable aspect about affect demonstrated by the children in my study was that it shifts. A

single child can experience all three levels of reading affect (association, conceptualization, and self-direction) depending on the book (what is being read), the reading environment, and who is attendant while reading is occurring.

Association is the initial step in the awareness by the children of circumstances making an experience pleasurable or not pleasurable, and the initial link to repeat or avoid an experience. When the experience is pleasurable and is repeated, affect advances to the conceptual level. The conceptual level requires a greater degree of thought and readers begin to compare their needs, abilities, aspirations, characteristics, and drive to that of others as a consequence of repeated associations with verbal and non-verbal feedback. Affect situates a reader in relation to other readers and influences readers' perception of their ability to read. The more that pleasant experiences are experienced and remembered, the more the children read. The associative and conceptual levels are reciprocal because when readers see their reading ability in a positive light, their associations with the experience are pleasurable and, consequently they want to repeat the reading experience thereby advancing them to the third level of affect. The third and highest level of complexity to affect is self-direction. At this level affect takes on a greater metacognitive role because readers reflect on their own needs, abilities, aspirations, characteristics and drive, and go beyond the conceptual to considering how to develop and take control of their reading experiences. Positive associations increase which in turn leads to more complex conceptualizations which in turn leads to greater self-direction.

The dynamic role of positive affect in the development of reading in school is highly social. The children's perceptions indicated that positive affect enabled them as readers to see their ability in a positive light, their associations with the experience were pleasurable, and consequently they were able to repeat the experience and thus acquire self-direction which is at the highest level of affect.

There is also evidence, though not from Robeck and Wallace (1990) but from the work of Isen, Daubman and Nowicki (1987); Nichols, Jones and Hancock (2003); and Pekrun (1992) that negative affect can have positive consequences. I have discussed examples from my research to indicate that negative affect can indeed have positive consequences from a social, or a textual perspective. These perspectives are to be taken into account in terms of the location of the event of reading.

When Knute in kindergarten, for example, explained that he did not like to read, there were aspects of the reading situation that had to have had positive affect. He gained positive affect from the control he had in the reading situation when he read to his baby brother at home. He also was compelled to read "all" the books on his shelf, a delayed pleasure. According to the theory of affect, Kieran, another kindergartener should have been avoiding reading, after all, his mom who was a powerful role model got upset with him. To avoid her anger he understandably should have replaced reading with an activity that was more pleasurable (Robeck & Wallace, 1990). Kieran is a good example of how positive affect is stronger than the negative affect he experienced with his mom. Kieran's feelings of interest, excitement and enjoyment, indicated by his appreciation of reading situations with his dad, brother, and younger sister, led him to read and to return to reading again and again (Pulver, 1999). Over time he had reached a level of conceptualization and had gone beyond it to self-regulate, to read again, to persevere in learning to read. Resiliency is not only to be found in older children but also in emergent readers. Kimberly in kindergarten was another example of someone who loved to be called upon to "read" in class even though she knew she did not know how to read words. Although she reproached herself for not knowing, she was able to construct a positive perspective that she was still capable of learning and would do so in grade one in school.

Furthermore at the level of affective conceptualization where the children start comparing themselves with others, negative affect is represented in the theory of affect according to Robeck and Wallace (1990) as being basically permanent. But when teachers in my study were not perceived as providing positive support or gave mixed messages to the children about their reading and performance, the children turned elsewhere for positive support, for example to parents, if not parents then to themselves. Thomasina in grade two perceived that the teacher did not think she was good at reading in front of the children in the classroom, so she read at home to her parents and her brother. Kelly in kindergarten perceived that the teacher was not interested in her reading and when her parents were unable to listen and negotiate meaning, she kept on reading herself.

Nor does the theory of affect as proposed by Robeck and Wallace (1990) make accommodation for two intellectual and physical spaces, school and home, where the children feel one way about reading at home and another in school. The theory of reading affect has to be extended to include those who are involved in the reading event inclusive of the actual process of learning words and ideas and constructing meaning. A significant person can support or detract from children's reading affect, making it positive, negative or neutral. The theoretical implications suggest that there are at least four aspects to children reading affect, the textual aspect, who is attendant at the reading event, the environment in which it occurs, and the highly social aspects of positive reading affect.

Applied Implications of Affect

Who in the education system would need to know of the changes to the theory of affect in terms of current practice? The following section describes those who would need to know and could make a difference to how children learn to read and read to learn. They include teacher educators and other educational professionals, as well as teachers in their relationship with the home, and the students.

Teacher Educators and Educational Professionals

Future teachers of reading must take into account that negative affect is not mutually exclusive from positive and neutral affect. Negative affect may sometimes be turned to positive purposes. Future teachers must also take into account the preferences and desires of emergent readers. Reading is not a unitary event; it is an activity and process that has different associations contingent upon location, home, and school. Home and school factors must also be integrated into future theories of affect, if we are to increase the breadth and depth of what emergent readers bring to the reading experience. Teacher educators need to prepare future regular classroom teachers not only to know the ties between the two intellectual spaces but also to listen to their students. Teachers in primary and elementary schools need to be aware that the children take what they say directly to heart. Teachers comments to children are not brushed off easily or taken lightly and may have enduring consequences.

Throughout the following sections of chapter five, teacher practice, school practice, gender, and other perspectives arise that also need to be taken into account in teacher education, such as the need for the teacher to talk to children about their liking for reading and what to do when the children express negative affect. Teachers must understand that many children see teachers as evaluators. Teachers need to teach children about different genres, about reading strategies for different genres, to explain miscues in a positive light, and to explain the negative effects of teasing. New teachers have to understand that they need to portray the value of reading. Teachers need to understand that girls need time to talk about what they are reading and that they do not speak as readily in whole class situations. They also need to be aware of the structure of small group reading situations, not only in terms of gender but also in terms of assigned tasks. They need to know the research concerning boys' need for attention. They need to know that boys and girls perceive reading differently from each other.

Teacher Practice

Robeck and Wallace (1990) noted when children are young they are most likely to be influenced affectively by the conceptualizations of their parents, in primary school affective influence shifts to the teacher, in junior high to peers, and in high school to the opposite gender (p. 36). More recently Chapman, Tunmer and Prochnow (2000) reported on the influencing role of the teacher in terms of performance and attention and the children's vulnerability to negative evaluation. The differences in the children's responses, both positive and negative, in my study appeared to be created in part by perceived interest or lack of interest by the teacher.

Teachers need to ask children if they like reading and if the answer is no, not to get angry or tell the children "you can't mean that" but to start looking for where and how and why the child is perceiving reading in that light, especially as learning to read can be hard and frustrating even for students with high ability. Learning to read requires pleasure, choice, time, persistence, support, and on the part of adults - patience. Positive affect and persistence are aspects of resiliency and so is the support of one positive adult in a child's life.

For children the role of text, the reading of particular kinds of books indicated not only emerging ability but also maturity in reading tastes. In order to gain pleasure they have to comprehend text. Teachers need to teach children about different kinds of texts and that different genres require different strategies for reading which have to be taught and learned. Learning takes time and effort but need not be unpleasant. The children's interests are important and they too need to be accommodated in class. After all, many topics in which they are interested are to be found in informational texts. They need to know how to read them to explore their interests and come to a fuller understanding of their interests, and their sources of pleasure. Their interest helps in their determination to learn to read. Teaching reading in a positive atmosphere, keeping the learning positive, helping children to view reading as a process, explaining that process to the

children so that they realize that they go through a process and there are a variety of strategies they can use to help themselves; teaching them that miscues are indications of where their understanding is not clear, miscues are a natural part of reading and learning to read. Everyone makes miscues! Knowing that everyone makes miscues, their self-esteem can remain intact during the process of learning to read and reading to learn. Reading is not "practicing words," reading is coming to understand what an author is saying; reading is broadening the mind and reading is a means of developing the whole person.

Furthermore, literature circles are worthwhile and enjoyed by the children as an entrance into a community of readers (Evans, 2002), the teacher's role was perceived by the children in my study as evaluative. Time needs to be made for reading that is not evaluated reading, that does not require a report or to be reported. The children described getting a choice in what they read in school, but when it came to the literature circles in grades two and four, there was little or no choice. Both control and a sense of independence are important aspects of self-direction in that the individual knowing his/her strengths, weaknesses, and values, is free to experiment, organize, and create (Robeck & Wallace, 1990).

Peers, even without talking to them about it, knew what their friends read. I suspect the notion of being better at reading, a plausible cause of teasing, could be eliminated if teachers were more aware of and sensitive to variability in student performance. Teachers can also help to validate the idea that learning how to read different genres can be exciting. It is acceptable not to like everything. School needs to be seen as a place where everyone values reading and the many different genres of reading. Otherwise, children are driven to go elsewhere for support and some children may not always have somewhere else to go. Reading for young children is a highly social event. It is important that teachers have a better understanding of positive affect in children's reading development. When children come to school, they come with positive reading affect, but in

my study, once school took over, there was ample evidence to show that negative affect came into play and was subtly and not so subtly having deleterious consequences for the children's interest in and response to reading.

School Practice and the Home Connection

Schools need to look at how they portray the value of reading; the message should be that reading is very important. Schooling is meant to help develop well-rounded individuals capable of leading purposeful lives. Not being able to read or read well leaves children with fewer options in life - even fewer options by the time they reach junior high, if not before. As most children come to school wanting to learn how to read, I think fulfilling that particular need is paramount in the lives of the children. Reading at home was fundamental to these middle class children's positive associations with and negotiation during reading at the outset. The children perceived home as placing a positive value on reading. Discussion and negotiation could take place at home. There was time to read, access to materials, choice in what they read, and ownership of some reading material at least when they were starting to read. These factors along with being read to confirmed for the children that their parents valued reading and were reported by the children in my study. Teachers *must* take these factors into consideration to inform their practice in school. The effort in schools should be to keep affect in the realm of the positive. Some of these children perceived school as an environment in which their expectations for reading could not always be fulfilled.

Chapman and Tunmer (1995) and Chapman, Tunmer and Prochnow (2000) have studied both children's reading self-concept and academic self-concept; the former involved competence, difficulty and attitude, and the latter involved skill mastery, ease/difficulty of task, and teacher interpretation of performance (2000, p. 703). In their New Zealand study of 60 new school entrants, they reported that children could discern their positive and negative reading affect within the first two months of beginning school and starting to learn to read. Chapman and Tunmer and

Prochnow's study is unlike the other studies that I have described, McKenna, Kear and Ellsworth (1995), Kush and Watkins (1996), and Davies and Brember (1993). In these larger studies negative affect increased over a much more extended period of time. In my study, starting with a group of kindergarten children, reading was seen as pleasurable at home and sometimes in school. But positive school reading affect as described by the children declined as their time in school increased. The children's perception of reading in school in my study was very different from home.

The children did not view everything about school in a negative manner. The use of the school library increased as the grades increased in my study. Being able to sustain control in the library, the location where they were allowed choice, access and time, if only to choose, the children talked of becoming engaged and remaining involved. Involvement leads to perseverance, independence, and autonomy in reading. Supportive teachers help to ensure that these factors are consistent for all the children in their classes. However, without the children feeling a sense of control over their reading interests, their performance in reading will fall far short of their potential.

Successful teachers have for years been implementing in their teaching practice many of these factors and elements described by the children. Such experiences include letting the children make their own decisions about what to read, utilizing a variety of genre, teaching a variety of strategies, teaching children to think critically, providing immediate positive feedback and "fostering long-term beliefs that students can become good readers and writers" (Pressley, Rankin & Yokoi, 1996 p. 379).

Teachers, teacher educators and educational professionals need to keep in mind the variability of those individuals that they teach and that there are some factors that the children perceive as aiding their positive affect and enabling them to learn to read and to read to learn. These factors include the whole notion of reading as a process not simply as an activity. Negative

affect can sometimes have positive results but teachers need to realize how powerful their words can be to young children. Words need to be carefully chosen especially as children may see the teacher as an evaluator. Maintaining positive affect and portraying the value of reading for children includes support through teaching reading strategies and genres and allowing that not everyone likes everything. Perhaps most importantly everyone miscues! Allowing children time to read, to have access to and to choose their reading material as well as ensuring ownership of reading material are important when children are first being initiated into reading. Finally, when dealing with whole class and small group teaching, gender and ability must be taken into account. As my study is about the students' perceptions, it is important to recognize their contributions as well.

Students

Students have a lot to contribute to our understanding of reading affect. They are informed and knowledgeable partners in education and deserve a greater and more significant place in terms of teaching, theory and practice. They have knowledge of materials and programs and how they work for them. We need to listen.

Differences in Affective Responses

How did children's articulation of their affective responses differ among the grades, in terms of reading proficiency and gender? The teachers' judgment reflected a difference in gender but, these were not borne out in the reading proficiency results or in the children's responses.

Gender

Reporting their perceptions of themselves in the light of affect, home, school, and peers the children in my sample demonstrated differences in gender. For example, before the end of kindergarten three of the children, all girls, perceived that they did not get a regular opportunity to talk to the teacher. The girls showed a need for teacher, home, and peer attention. The need was expressed as time to talk. Research has shown that girls do not speak as much in whole classroom

settings (Blousted, 1989; Holden, 1993). Not new to the research area is the notion that boys get more attention than girls in the classroom (Brophy & Good, 1970; Palardy, 1969; 1998). According to Jordan (1995), boys will force the situation in the classroom to get more attention.

We know that talk in the classroom is occurring around books in literature circles. What is happening with the girls' talk in small groups? Every member of a literature circle has a task, for example to be the discussion director who develops a list of questions. Further descriptions of how participation evolves in literature circles may help in understanding how and when the different genders participate in discussion of questions they may have about a text. If you are not the questioner for that particular day or week or for that book, when do you get to ask your questions? If you are the questioner, do you have all the right answers? Are the questions only personally relevant for that one person? At what point do the children engage in collaborative discussion? When children are placed in a literature circles we know from the children that they get the choice of three titles, are they then grouped by ability or by the title they have chosen? Peer-led groups may need to take ability and gender into account. These are reasons to reconsider what transpires in literature circles. The way that literature circles are currently structured may not deal with these issues and therefore may not have extended beneficial effects.

The boys described reading for relief of boredom. Both the boys and the girls reported that boys like to read specific genre, at specific times, in specific places. The girls were perceived by both genders as liking reading more than boys, reading more broadly and with greater ability. My perception though from the boys' reports in grade four is that ***the boys are learning in school that they do not like reading*** and girls, though they may perceive themselves as natural readers, do not understand when they do not get it right. Tulsa, for example, reported reading as requiring performance and practice of a book at the appropriate level. Thomasina practiced at home. Kelly in kindergarten practiced. She described herself wanting to learn how to read but was not sure how to

get help. The girls implied that they did not know what to do to get it right, which leaves me to wonder what that says to them as female readers. The concept of who is a reader would appear to be difficult for both genders.

Boys and girls perceived that the teacher evaluated **all** reading in school. The only way to maintain control over books they were interested in was to **not talk** to the teacher about them. School was seen as a place where they could not negotiate meaning. Both the boys and girls described their liking for reading but **both expressed dissatisfaction when reading was done in school.**

Can we say that what the children perceive about gender might be boundaries of some kind to being male or female readers? Yes and no. Millard (1997) in *Differently Literate*, although she studied children ages 10 - 11, stated that young children themselves create and adhere to stereotypical divisions by gender regardless of the actions and behavior of the teachers and that children come to school already modeling gender "appropriate" behaviors. Pidgeon (1994) described children as basically developing gender attributes between the ages of three and ten. So what is untypical about the children in my research study? In my study, girls indicated that boys were treated differently, they described that difference as upsetting for them because they were held to a higher standard of expectation, boys did not have to meet that expectation, and the boys were allowed to have fun reading. Little boys who could read well described their anxiety about reading better than other boys. Oral reading in school was noted by children in both grades two and four as unpleasant. Interestingly Biggs and Bruder (1987) describing a study of 128 adults with poor reading ability, found that 60% of their participants remembered the experience of oral reading as negative. In my study when it came to reading information books there were no differences until grade four. Informational texts were used and were available in both kindergarten and grade two

classrooms. Kora was the only child who mentioned that she was not allowed to bring them home from school.

As illustrated throughout chapter four, the children were quite able to articulate their reading affect and not unexpectedly, the clarity of the articulation increased with each successive grade. In theory children prefer positive reading affect, negative reading affect no matter where or from whom it came was seen as a form of punishment to be avoided. Whether the questions were asked of the kindergarten, the grade two or the grade four children, they all reported seeking, giving and receiving pleasure from reading. They asked their parents to read to them. They read to their parents, siblings, and friends, including baby-sitters, and dogs. They repeated reading experiences. In the final analysis though, boys appear to be learning in school that they do not like reading. Reading is a performance-based activity and to maintain control over reading material that you find of interest **you do not talk to the teacher**. How then was reading affect related to their reading proficiency?

Reading Proficiency

Even though there were not many differences in terms of gender of reading proficiency across the grades, those that the children described were quite striking. The children's perceptions concerning reading proficiency appeared to be gender-based. In order for the children to become proficient at reading, what do they perceive as being proficient? How can they become more proficient if their perceptions are gender-based?

1. Almost one-third of the girls (6) perceived that boys appeared to be getting more reading support in school and from the boys' reports they were getting more support at home than the girls.

2. The girls and boys perceived that the boys appeared to be under less pressure to perform in school as they were seen to play at reading. They may have had more control over what they read.
3. Both the girls and the boys perceived that the boys appeared not to be held to the same standards as girls by teachers. The references to play noted above by both genders implied lower expectations for the boys.

No girl in my sample reached the highest levels of reading proficiency on the TERA-2. All who did were boys. Rather 18.5% of the boys in my sample (five boys – one in kindergarten, one in grade two and three in grade four) did. At the kindergarten level the teacher perceived that two girls read at a higher level of reading proficiency, after kindergarten the teacher judgment indicated that there were thee times as many boys as girls perceived as being at the highest levels of reading proficiency or 33.3%. Such a difference is startling. Even stranger is that the results of the TERA-2 indicated that more boys scored at the lower levels of reading proficiency. Girls (3) judged as high by the teacher generally scored as average on the test of reading proficiency. The teachers scored fewer boys (3) as having a low reading proficiency level than girls (5). Yet none of the children in my study rated themselves as poor readers. I suspect the reason why the boys achieved higher was because they described using more reading strategies and they were still being read to at the end of grade four. Paris (1991) studying reading comprehension noted, "good readers generally exhibited three observable strategies as they read" (p. 680). Among the strategies he included were: using the title to discern the topic, rereading and skimming to make inferences, and using context clues to discover word meanings (p. 680). The children in my study described rereading, skimming and context clues. Shapiro and Whitney (1997) described oral parental reading as a positive factor in leisure time reading; it may also be an element in reading achievement.

Affective Responses by Grade

Further indications are that a decrease in positive affect for school reading occurred as the grades increased and that reading in general had increasingly less significance in the lives of the children. Consider the following:

- Kindergarten

  Positive affect toward reading held by most of the children by the end of kindergarten had come to include content and ability as aspects of reading for pleasure.

- Two

  The positive affect of interest, excitement and enjoyment continued to activate and guide the interpretation of words, but while the attainment of self-direction in reading seemed to free the children to be intrinsically motivated, unfortunately self-direction in school was not fostered. Boys conceived reading as a stage of growing up and a way of relieving boredom and girls thought of reading as a skill to be practiced, taking time away from other things.

- Four

  Reading for the grade fours was seen as a form of art as well as educating, soothing, entertaining, and relieving boredom. By grade four there appeared to be two kinds of reading, public and private. Take Felipe or Frederica for example, the former read at home but would not take a book on a sleepover. Frederica liked picture books but would not read them in school unless it was sanctioned, like when her class did an author study. School reading did not have the same

intrinsic value for the children and they did not spontaneously share their reading with their friends. Reading for school was described in generally negative terms

The children in the three grades basically described their expectations that reading would educate, soothe, entertain, be artistic, make sense, and relieve boredom. I suggest first and foremost that the function of reading, based on the children's responses, was to initiate and be initiated by "interest-excitement, enjoyment-joy," which we know to be aspects of positive affect (Pulver, 1999). Initiation implies learning how to read independently, reading by oneself. The children in general do not describe reading in school by appealing to such positively affective terms.

Concluding Thoughts on Further Research

Taking the children's words about the difficulty of learning to read and the difficulty in grade four of finding interesting informational material, are the children describing their determination both in learning to read and in reading to learn? One boy perceived learning to read as "a stage of growing up" and perhaps as Mrazek and Mrazek (1987) put it, "Some children have a remarkable capacity for resilience. However, personal characteristics and life circumstances may have to go hand in hand for resilience to be truly successful" (p. 365). Smith (2003) researched avenues for "Strengthening Beliefs Systems around Resiliency in Middle School Students," a way of thinking and behaving that enables children to cope with the major stresses in their lives. As already noted being positive is one aspect of resiliency. Positive affect is needed to be resilient. Research on how children cope, what drives them to persist in learning to read, what instills that desire to be resilient is critically important to furthering our understanding of emergent readers.

My descriptive study was not about teacher perceptions but student perceptions. It was carried out because we have so few studies from the students' perspective. Professional standards adhered to and displayed by the teachers involved in the study were not part of the study. The

findings and conclusions can be viewed as navigating another path to discovering how children learn to read and what keeps them reading (Newkirk, 1996).

There were differences perceived by the children according to gender, reading proficiency, and grade. They were significant because they provided information on the source of the children's affect toward reading whether it was home, and those at home, school, and those at school, teaching methods, reading materials, other mediating factors, or some combination of these. The children also identified which factors and elements of their reading experiences that they thought helped to create positive affect that allowed them to learn to read and to want to continue to read to learn. Contrarily, they identified those factors and elements that they perceived hindered their ability to learn to read and to want to read to learn.

Although not generalizable given the size of my study, the children have raised issues that could be researched more extensively in the future. These issues include: As reading affect shifts and there is more than one intellectual and physical space in which children learn to read and continue to read to learn, more research needs to be done on reading ability and achievement over time as these are not fixed or set. Further research is necessary both on how the children cope with the stress of the performance side of reading and how their teachers cope with the stress of achievement testing. How achievement testing pressures affect in how teachers teach and interact with their students. Further study in terms of gender is extremely important with regard to how each gender learns to read, what their needs are during reading, and after reading whether reading and discussions of reading occur in a whole class or small group, and the gender makeup of the group. The notion that the children brought up of reading as fun is interesting for further research because children at both grades two and four brought up humor as a reason for reading and reading as fun was mentioned by the children in kindergarten. Reading is fun when you understand what you are reading. It would also be interesting to find out, whether the findings of my study would be

replicated were the study to be carried out with children from a lower socio-economic background that is children living in inner-city areas. Would the value for reading and reading affect be different for inner-city children? If so, why?

On the basis of my research I have become profoundly aware that we must listen to the children we teach. Children can tell us so much about what we need to know in order to teach them well. My study has shown that even young children are able to tell us what their needs are for their positive reading development. More research is needed to increase our understanding of the needs of emergent, middle, and adolescent readers if we are to sustain life-long reading. My study of children's affect in response to and toward reading was a very rewarding and fulfilling work. From the children, I learned the strength and durability of their perceptions. I learned that our understanding of reading must be improved by the words of children.

REFERENCES

Alexander, J. E. & Filler, R. C. (1976). *Attitudes and reading*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Alexander, P. A. & Murphy, P. K. (1999). What cognitive psychology has to say to school psychology: Shifting perspectives and shared purposes. In C. R. Reynolds & T. B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (pp. 167-193). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Almasi, J. F. (1995). The nature of fourth graders' sociocognitive conflicts in peer-led and teacher-led discussions of literature. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 314-351.

Applegate, K.A. (1998). *The Hork-Bajir Chronicles*. New York: Scholastic.

Arizpe, E. & Styles, M. (2003). *Children reading pictures: Interpreting visual texts*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Athey, I. J. & Holmes, J. A. (1969). *Reading success and personality characteristics in junior high school students*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Baker, L., Scher, D., & Mackler, K. (1997). Home and family influences on motivations for reading. *Educational Phychologist, 32*, 69-82.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Michael Holquist (Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barrs, M. (1994). Introduction: Reading the difference. In M. Barr and S. Pidgeon (Eds.), *Reading the difference: Gender and reading in elementary classrooms* (pp. 1-13). York, ME: Stenhouse.

Beers, G. K (1996). No time, no interest, no way! The three voices of aliteracy (Part 2). *School Library Journal, 42*, 110-113.

Beers, G. K. (1996). No time, no interest, no way! The three voices of aliteracy (Part 1). *School Library Journal, 42*, 30-33.

Biggs, S. A. & Bruder, M. N. (1987). Adult memories of early reading experiences. *Educational Horizons, 66*, 34-37.

Bintz, W. P. (1993). Resistant readers in secondary education: Some insights and implications. *Journal of Reading, 36*, 604-615.

Blousted, M. W. (1989). Who talks? The position of girls in mixed sex classrooms. *English in Education, 23* (3), 41—51.

Bottomley, D. M., Truscott, D. M., Marinak, B. A., Henk, W. A. & Melnick, S. A. (1999). An affective comparison of whole language, literature-based, and basal reader literacy instruction. *Reading Research and Instruction, 38*, 115-129.

Bourgeois, P. (1999). *Franklin's class trip*. Toronto, ON: Kids Can Press.

Bradley, L. & Bryant, P. (1985). *Rhyme and reason in reading and spelling*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Brophy, J. E. & Good, T. L. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 61*, 365-374.

Brown, S. (1993). *Playing on the path to literacy*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Bruner, J. S. Matter, J., & Papanek, M. L. (1955). Breadth of learning as a function of drive level and mechanization. *Psychological Review, 62*, 1-10.

Bus, A. G. (2001). Parent-Child book reading through the lens of attachment theory. L. Verhoeven & C. E. Snow, (Eds.), *Literacy and motivation: Reading engagement in individuals and groups* (pp. 39-53). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Caswell, L. J. & Duke, N. (1998). Non-narrative as a catalyst for literacy development. *Language Arts, 75*, 108-117.

Chall, J. S. (1996). *Stages of reading development* (3rd. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chambers, A. (1969). *The reluctant reader*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Chapman, J. W. & Tunmer, W. E. (1995). Development of young children's reading self-concepts: An examination of emerging subcomponents and their relationship with reading achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*, 154-167.

Chapman, J. W., Tunmer, W.E., & Prochnow, J. E., (2000). Early reading-related skills and performance, reading self-concept, and the development of academic self-concept: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*, 703-708.

Children's Literature Research Centre. (1996). *Young people's reading at the end of the century*. London: CLRC, Roehampton Institute.

Clay, M. M. (1979). Reading: *The patterning of complex behaviour*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cohen, S. G., McDonnell, G. & Osborn, B. (1989). Self-perceptions of "at risk" and high achieving readers: Beyond Reading Recovery achievement data. In S. McCormick & J. Zutell (Eds.), *Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction* (pp. 117-122). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Corsini, R. J. (1999). *The dictionary of psychology*. Philadelphiz, PA: Brunner/Mazel.

Cramer, E. H. & Castle, M. (1994). *Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Cresswell, J. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crowder, R. G. & Wagner, R. K. (1992*). The psychology of reading: An introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cullingford, C. (1998). *Children's literature and its effects: The formative years*. London: Cassell.

Dahl, K. L. & Freppon, P. A. (1995). A comparison of innercity children's interpretations of reading and writing instruction in the early grades in skills-based and whole language classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 50-74.

Dahl, R. (1983). *The witches*. London: Penguin.

Damasio, A. (1999). *The feeling of what happens: Body and emotion in the making of consciousness*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Davies, J. & Brember, I. (1993). Comics or stories? Differences in the reading attitudes and habits of girls and boys in years 2, 4 and 6. *Gender and Education, 5*, 305-320.

DeCorte, E., Greer, B., & Verschaffel, L. (1996). Mathematics teaching and learning. In D.C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.). *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 491-549). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DeTemple, J. M. & Snow, C. E. (2001). Conversations about literacy: Social mediation of psycholingistic activity. In L. Verhoeven & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Literacy and motivation: Reading engagement in individuals and groups* (pp. 55-69). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dressman, M. (1997). Congruence, resistance, liminality: Reading and ideology in three school libraries. *Curriculum Inquiry, 27*, 267-315.

English, H. B. & English, A. C. (1958). *A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical terms: A guide to usage*. New York: David McKay.

Evans, K.S. (2002). Fifth-grade students' perceptions of how they experience literature discussion groups. Reading Research Quarterly, 37 (1), 46-69.

Everhart, R. B. (1983). *Reading, writing and resistance: Adolescence and labor in a junior high school.* Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Freppon, P. A. (1991). Children's concepts of the nature and purpose of reading in different instructional settings. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 23,* 139-163.

Frijda, N.H. (1993). Moods, emotion episodes, and emotions. In M. Lewis and J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 381-404). New York: The Guilford Press.

Gaffney, J. S. & Anderson, R. C. (2000). Trends in reading research in the United States: Changing intellectual currents over three decades. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson and R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 53-74). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gee, J. P., & Green, J. L. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Research in Education, 23,* 119-171.

Gibson, E. J. & Levin, H. (1975). *The psychology of reading.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Theory & resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Goodman, K. (1994). Reading, writing, and written texts: A transactional sociopsycholinguistic view. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell and H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 1093-1130). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goodwin, L. (1996). *Aliteracy among college students: Why don't they read?* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 410 527)

Gopnik, A. & Graf, P. (1988). Knowing how you know: Young children's ability to identify and remember the sources of their beliefs. *Child Development, 59,* 1366-1371.

Gough, P. B. (1985). Information processing model. In H. Singer and R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 661-686). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Graesser, A., Golding, J. M. & Long, D. L. (1991). Narrative Representation and comprehension. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 171 – 205). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Greaney, V. & Hegarty, M. (1987).Correlates of leisure-time reading. *Journal of Research in Reading, 10,* 3-20.

Greaney, V. & Neuman, S. (1990). The functions of reading: A cross-cultural perspective. *Reading Research Quarterly, 25,* 172-195.

Guthrie, J. T. & Greaney, V. (1991). Literacy acts. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthall & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 2, pp. 68-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Guthrie, J. T. & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson and R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403-424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Guthrie, J. Ta. & Alvermann, D. A. (Eds). (1999). *Engaged reading: Processes, practices and policy implications*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hall, C. & Coles, M. (1999). *Children's reading choices*. London: Routledge.

Hall, N. Robinson, A. (1996). *Looking at literacy: Using images of literacy to explore the world of reading and writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Harris, T. L. & Hodges, R. E. (Eds.). (1995). *The literacy dictionary: The vocabulary of reading and writing*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Harris, T. L. & Hodges, R.E. (Eds.). (1981). *A dictionary of reading and related terms*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Haverty, L., Libersher, J., Libersher, M., Pellegrini, L., & Queeney, R. (1996). *Improving elementary school students' attitudes toward voluntary reading*. Unpublished master's project, St. Xavier University, Illinois. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 398 544

Heins, E. L. (1984). A Challenge to young – and old – adults. *Horn Book Magazine, 50*, 426-427.

Holden, C. (1993). Giving girls a chance: Patterns of talk in co-operative group work. Gender & Education, *5*, 179-191).

Huey, E. D. (1908). *The psychology and pedagogy of reading*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Isen, A.M., Daubman, K. A., & Nowicki, G. P. (1987). Positive affect facilitates creative problem solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 52*, 1122-1131.

Izard, C. (2000). Affect. *Encyclopedia of psychology*. (Vol.1, pp. 88). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association/ New York: Oxford University Press.

Jordan, E. (1995). Fighting boys and fantasy play: The construction of masculinity in the early years of school. *Gender and Education, 7*, 69-86.

Just, M. A. & Carpenter, P. A. (1987). *The psychology of reading and language comprehension*. Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Kettel, R. P. (1994). *Motivating the reluctant reader: Using the storytelling episode model*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 404 628.

Kintsch, W. (1986). On modeling comprehension. In S. de Castell, A. Luke, & K. Egan (Eds.), *Literacy, society, and schooling* (pp. 175-195). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Klesius, J., Laframboise, K.L, & Gaier, M. (1998). Humorous literature: Motivation for reluctant readers. *Reading Research and Instruction, 37*, 253-261.

Kubis, M. E. (1994). *The relationship between home literary environments and attitudes toward reading in ninth-grade students.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 385 822)

Kush, J. C. & Watkins, M. W. (1996). Long-term stability of children's attitudes toward reading. *The Journal of Educational Research, 89*, 315-319.

Leseman, P.P. & deJong, P. F. (2001). How important is home literacy for acquiring literacy in school? In L. Verhoeven & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Literacy and motivation: Reading engagement in individuals and groups* (pp. 71-93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Levine, G. C. (1997). *Ella Enchanted*. New York: Harper Collins.

Ley, T. C., Schaer, B. B., & Dismukes, B. W. (1994). Longitudinal study of the attitudes and behaviors of middle school students. *Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly, 15*, 11-38.

Liska, A. E. (1984). A critical examination of the causal structure of the Fishbein/Ajzen attitude-behavior model. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 47*, 61-74.

Mackey, M. (1993). The many faces of resistant reading. *English Journal, 82*, 69-74.

Margolis, H. & McCabe, P. P. (1996). Resistant readers? Look a little closer! *Special Services in the Schools, 12*, 19-47.

Mathewson, G. C. (1976). The function of attitude in the reading process. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 655-676). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Mathewson, G. C. (1994). Model of attitude influence upon reading and learning to read. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 1131 – 1161). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Matthews, M. M. (1966). *Teaching to read: Historically considered*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McKenna, M. C. (1994). Toward a model of reading attitude acquisition. In E. H. Cramer and M. Castle (Eds.), *Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education* (pp. 18 – 40). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

McKenna, M. C., Kear, D. J. & Ellsworth, R. A. (1995). Children's attitudes toward reading: A national survey. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 934-956.

McKenna, M. C., Stratton, B. D., Grindler, M. C. & Jenkins, S. J. (1995). Differential effects of whole language and traditional instruction on reading attitudes. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 27*, 19-44.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miall, D. S. & Kuiken, D. (1999). What is literariness: Three components of literary reading. *Discourse Processes, 28(2)*, 121-138.

Miall, D. S. (1989). Beyond the schema given: Affective comprehension of literary narratives. *Cognition and Emotion, 3*, 55-78.

Miall, D. S. (1995). Anticipation and feeling in literary response: A neuropsychological perspective. *Poetics, 23*, 275-298.

Mikulecky, L. (1978). *Aliteracy and a changing view of reading goals.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 157 052)

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Millard, E. (1997). *Differently literate: Boys, girls and the schooling of literacy.* London: The Falmer Press.

Minns, H. (1994). Three ten-year-old boys and their reading. In M. Barrs & S. Pidgeon (Eds.), Reading the difference: *Gender and reading in elementary classrooms* (pp. 61-71). York, ME: Stenhouse..

Mitchell, C. (1994). Reading reading of popular culture: Interrogating ideologies in the gendered practices in literacy classrooms. *Textual Studies in Canada 4*, 69-80.

Mitchell, T. L. & Ley, T. C. (1996). The reading attitudes and behaviors of high school students. *Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly, 17*, 65-92.

Morrow, L. M. & Gambrell, L. B. (2000). Literature-based reading instruction. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson and R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 563-586). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mrazek, P.J. & Mrazek, D.A. (1987). Resilience in child maltreatment victims: A conceptual exploration. Child Abuse & Neglect, *11*, 357-366.

Nell, V. (1988). *Lost in a book: The psychology of reading for pleasure.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Nell, V. (1994). The insatiable appetite. In E. H. Cramer and M. Castle (Eds.), *Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education* (pp. 41-52). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Newkirk, T. (1996). Seduction and betrayal in qualitative research. In P. Mortensen & G.E. Kirsch (Eds.), Ethics and representation in qualitative studies of literacy (pp 1-16). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Nichols, W. D., Jones, J. P. & Hancock, D. R. (2003). Teachers' influence on goal orientation: exploring the relationship between eighth graders' goal orientation, their emotional development, their perceptions of learning, and their teachers' instructional strategies. *Reading Psychology, 24*, 37-83.

Oatley, K. & Nundy, S. (1996). Rethinking the role of emotions in education. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The handbook of education and human development: New models of learning, teaching and schooling* (pp. 257-275). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Oppel, K. (1997). *Silverwing*. Toronto,ON: Harper Collins.

Palardy, J. M. (1969). What teachers believe – What children achieve. *The Elementary School Journal, 69*, 370-374.

Palardy, J. M. (1998). The effects of teachers' expectations on children's literacy development. *Reading Improvement, 35*, 184-186.

Palmer, B. M., Codling, R. M., & Gambrell, L. B. (1994). In their own words: What elementary students have to say about motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher, 48*, 176-178.

Paris, S.G. (1991). Portfolio assessment for young readers. *The Reading Teacher, 44* (9), 680-682.

Paterson, K. (1991). *Lyddie*. New York: Lodestar Books.

Pekrun, R. (1992). The impact of emotions on learning and achievement: Towards a theory of cognitive/motivational mediators. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 41* (4), 359-376.

Phillips, L. M., Norris, S. P., Osmond, W. C., & Marynard, A. M. (2002). Relative reading achievement: A longitudinal study of 187 children from first through sixth grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*, 3-13.

Pidgeon, S. (1994). Learning reading and learning gender. In M. Barrs & S. Pidgeon (Eds.), *Reading the difference: Gender and reading in elementary classrooms* (pp.21-34). York, ME: Stenhouse.

Pressley, M., Rankin, J., & Yokoi, L. (1996). A survey of instructional practices of primary teachers nominated as effective in promoting literacy. *Elementary School Journal, 96* (4), 363-383.

Pulver, S. E. (1999). Shame and guilt: A synthesis. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry, 19* (3), 388-406.

Rasinski, T. V. & DeFord, D. E. (1988). First graders' conceptions of literacy: A matter of schooling. *Theory into Practice, 27*, 53-61.

Reid, D. K., Hresko, W. P. & Hammill, D. H. (1989). *Test of early reading ability* (2 ed.). Austin, TX: Pro-ed.

Ritchie, J. S. (1992). Resistance to reading: Another view of the minefield. *Journal of Advance Composition, 12*, 117-136.

Robeck, M. C. & Wallace, R. R. (1990). *The psychology of reading: An interdisciplinary approach.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Ruddell, R. B. & Speaker, R. B. (1985). The Interactive reading process: A model. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 751-793). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Ruddell, R. B. & Unrau, N. J. (1994). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R/ B/ Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.). *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 996-1056). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Samuels, S. J. (1994). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading revisited. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, and H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 816-837). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Samuels, S. J., Biesbrock, E., & Terry, P. R. (1974). The effect of pictures on children's attitudes toward presented stories. *The Journal of Educational Research, 67*, 243-246.

Schoenfeld, A. H. (1985). *Mathematical problem solving.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Schraw, G., Bruning, R., & Svoboda, C. (1995). Source of situational interest. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 27*, 1-17.

Shapiro, J. & White, W. (1991). Reading attitudes and perceptions in traditional and nontraditional reading programs. *Reading Research and Instruction, 30*, 52-66.

Shapiro, J. & Whitney, P. (1997). Factors involved in the leisure reading of upper elementary school students. *Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly, 18*, 343-370.

Shnayer, S. W. (1969). Relationships between reading interest and reading comprehension. In J. A. Figurel (Ed.), *Reading and realism* (pp. 698-702). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Simon, H. A. (1979). Information processing models of cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology, 30*, 363-396.

Smith, M. J., Greenlaw, M. J. & Scott, C. J. (1987). Making the literate environment equitable. *The Reading Teacher, 40*, 400-407.

Smith, S. I. (2003). Strengthening beliefs systems around resiliency in middle school students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (5-A), 1517. (UMI No. 3091296)

Smith, S. S. (1997). A longitudinal study: The literacy development of 57 children. In *Inquiries in literacy theory and practice: Forty-sixth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 250-264). Chicago, IL: The National Reading Conference.

Snow, C. (2000, May). Preventing reading difficulties. Paper presented at a research seminar at the Centre for Research on Literacy, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Snow, C. E., Barnes, W. S., Chandler, J., Goodman, I. F., & Hemphill, L. (1991). *Unfulfilled expectations: Home and school influences on literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Snow, R. E., Corno, L., & Jackson III, D. (1996). Individual differences in affective and conative functions. In D.C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 243-310). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Stahl, S. A. & Miller, P. D. (1989). Whole language and language experience approaches for beginning reading: A quantitative research systhesis. *Review of Educational Research, 59*, 87-116.

Stahl, S. A., McKenna, M. C. & Pagnucco, J. R. (1994). The effects of whole-language instruction: An update and a reappraisal. *Educational Psychologist, 29*, 175-185.

Stahl, S. A., Pagnucco, J. R. & Suttles, C. W. (1996). First graders' reading and writing instruction in traditional and process-oriented classes. *The Journal of Educational Research, 89*, 131-144.

Sulzby, E., & Teale, W. (1991). Emergent literacy. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 727-758). New York: Longman.

Thomas, K. F. & Barksdale-Ladd, M. A. (1997). Plant a radish, get a radish: Case study of kindergarten teachers' differing literacy belief systems. *Reading Research and Instruction. 37*, 39-60.

Turner, G. Y. (1992). Motivating reluctant readers: What can educators do? *Reading Improvement, 29*, 50-55.

Van der Bolt, L. & Tellegen, S. (1996). Sex differences in intrinsic reading motivation and emotional reading experience. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 15*, 337-349.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, M., Rafferty, H., & Turner I. (1992). Challenging the Matthew effects – Vocabulary acquisition for all? *Educational Psychology in Practice, 8*, 131-137.

Whitehead, F., Capey, A. C., Maddren, W. & Wellings, A. (1977). *Children and their books.* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Education.

Wigfield, A. & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 420-432.

Wilhelm, J. D. (1995a). The drama of engaged reading: extending the reader through classroom story drama. *Reading & Writing Quarterly:Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 11*, 335-358.

Wilhelm, J. D. (1995b). Reading is seeing: Using visual response to improve the literary reading of reluctant readers. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 27*, 467-503.

Worthy, J. (1996a). A matter of interest: Literature that hooks reluctant readers and keeps them reading. *The Reading Teacher, 50*, 204-212.

Worthy, J. (1996b). Removing barriers to voluntary reading for reluctant readers: The role of school and classroom libraries. *Language Arts, 73*, 483-492.

Worthy, J. (1998). "On every page someone gets killed!" Book conversations you don't hear in school. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 41*, 508-517.

Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist, 35*, 151-175.

Zajonc, R. B. (2000). Feeling and thinking: Closing the debate over the independence of affect. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social cognition* (pp 31-58). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX A

PSEUDONYMS AND IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

The following listing is a record of the pseudonyms given to the participants in my study and the identifying information when cited within the body of the text. The first number represents the child, the following letter, the child's gender (F- female, M – male), the next figure represents the question number on the CARP and the final series of numbers refer to the date that the child was interviewed.

Kindergarten

[01, F, 05/04/01]	Kayla
[02, F, 05/04/01]	Kelly
[03, M, 05/08/01]	Kennedy
[04, F, 05/09/01]	Kimberly
[05, M, 05/09/01]	Kieran
[06, M, 05/11/01]	Knute
[07, F, 05/15/01]	Kora
[08, M, 05/18/01]	Kojo
[09, F, 05/23/01]	Kristy

Grade Two

[10, M, 05/07/01]	Tanner
[11, F, 05/07/01]	Teresa
[12, F, 05/08/01]	Thomasina
[13, M, 05/08/01]	Titus
[14, M. 05/08/01]	Tor
[15, M, 05/09/01	Tripp
[16, F, 05/09/01]	Tulsa
[17, M, 05/10/01]	Tully
[18, M, 05/10/01]	Tyler

Grade Four

[19, F, 05/04/01]	Faith
[20, F, 05/10/01]	Fania
[21, M, 05/11/01]	Felipe
[22, M, 05/11/01]	Felix
[23, M, 05/15/01]	Ferdinand
[24, M, 05/15/01]	Finlay
[25, M, 05/16/01]	Foster
[26, F, 05/22/01]	Frederica
[27, F, 05/29/01]	Freya

APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHERS, PARENTS, AND STUDENTS

The three forms included in appendix D are consent forms presented to the teachers, parents and students who participated in the study.

Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading

University of Alberta

Teacher Research Consent Form

I, _____, hereby consent to participate in the research study on Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading. The purpose of the research is to find out children's feelings and images of reading. The results of the research may enable teachers to identify early how children feel about reading and to monitor their feelings about reading as they progress through school.

I understand that I will not be identified in any way in the reporting of the study, nor my students, nor my school. I understand that I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. I know I may review, if I wish, any information I give to the researcher to determine its accuracy. I also know that the amount of time I will spend with the researcher will be no more than fifteen minutes unless I require more.

Name (please print) _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading

University of Alberta

Child Research Consent Form (To be completed by parent/guardian)

I, _____, hereby give consent for my child _____ to participate in research on Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading. The purpose of the research is to find out about children's feelings and images of reading. The results of the research will help teachers identify early how children feel about reading and enable teachers to monitor children's feelings about reading as they progress through school in order to offer a better reading program.

As children's educational histories may also affect their perception of reading, I acknowledge that my child has attended one or more of the following: pre-school _____, junior-kindergarten _____, day care _____, was cared for at home _____ and that my child has attended the participating school since starting school. Yes _____ No _____. If No, then when attending another school my child used an anthology (textbook reader) _____, trade literature picture books ____ or something else _____.

_____.

(Please place a tick mark where appropriate and explain which reading program you recall your child participating in if s/he went to another school).

I understand that the study will involve my child in approximately two one half-hour sessions during a one-month period. One session will involve participation in an audio taped interview, where children respond to the Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading Profile (CARP) and a second session will involve participation in the *Test of Early Reading Ability* (TERA-2).

I understand that any information my child gives in the interview (CARP) or on the TERA-2 will remain confidential and discussed only with the researcher's dissertation supervisor. I understand that my child will not be identified in any way in the reporting of the results of the research. I understand that my child has the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. I also understand that I also have the right to withdraw my child from the research at any time. No raw data will be given to anyone else at any time without further written permission.

I also understand that the results of this research will be submitted for publication as part of the researcher's doctoral dissertation in educational journals and conference presentations.

_____ _____

Date signed: Signature of parent/legal guardian

For further information concerning the completion of the form, please contact Agnes Maynard, University of Alberta, 492-4273, ext.262.

Children's Affect in Response to and Toward Reading
University of Alberta
Child Research Consent Form (To be completed by child)

Hi,

I want to find out about how children feel about reading. Knowing how you and other children feel about reading will help me to understand how children think about reading. I am going to write a story about children's feelings about reading. Your answers to my questions will be part of the story but I won't use your name.

When we have our conversation about your feelings about reading, you can stop at any time.

Do you understand that we can stop at any time? Yes _____ No _____
Do you want to help? Yes _____ No _____
Please write your name on the line below.

_____

Name
(Signature of Child)

APPENDIX C

CHILDREN'S AFFECT IN RESPONSE TO AND TOWARD READING PROFILE

Hi, my name is Agnes Maynard, I want to find out about how children feel about reading. Knowing how you and other children feel about reading will help me to understand how children think about reading. I'm going to write a story about children's feelings about reading. You will be in the story but no one will know it is you. Do you understand? Do you have any questions?
We can stop at any time. Would you like to help?
Name: _____ Grade: _____ Date: _____
Pre-school _____Day Care _____ Junior Kindergarten _____ Home _____
Have you attended any other school? Yes _____No _____
If Yes, Did you have a reading textbook at the other school?
Did your use picture books and chapter books for reading?
If No, go to question one.
I would like to talk to you about when you read at home, at school and with friends. Let's start with you.

Self-perception

Affect	1. Tell me, what do you like to read?
Affect	2. What's your favourite book to read?
Affect	3. Do you like to read it over and over?
	Probe: Tell me about it/How come?
Location	4. Where do you keep your favourite book (or whatever)?
	Probe: How come?
Time	5. How long have you been reading?
Affect	6. Does reading make you feel good? Why?
	Probe: Does it depend on what you read?
	Probe: ...Can you tell me more?
	7. What do you do when you finish a book?
	Probe: a) Start reading it again b) Turn off the light and start dreaming about it c) Put the book away d) Start a new book

Utilitarian/ 8. Why do you read? (Shapiro & White, 1991)

Self-development/
Pleasure 9. Which is more important, getting the words right or understanding the story?

Ability/Self-perception 10. Are you a pretty good reader?

Probe: How do you know? (Family, Friends, Teacher)

Probe: Does your teacher tell you, you are a good reader?

Ability Probe: Would you like to be able to read better? Why?

Probe: How could you become a better reader?

Ability 11. What do you do when you come to a word you don't know?

OK, let's talk about reading at home...

Home

Others 12. Do you have any brothers or sisters?

Probe: Do they read to you?

Probe: Do they read?

Probe: Do you read to them?

Probe: Do they read to you?

Probe: Do you read to your mom and dad?

Method 13. How did you learn to read? Tell me about it?

Or

13. Tell me about learning to read.

Time/Location/Affect 14.When you are at home, do you have a favourite time to read?

Probe: Tell me about it.

Probe: What is the best time to read?

Probe: Do you read before you go to bed?

Location/Affect 15. Do you have a favourite place to read?

Location/Access

Probe: Where else do you read?
a) In the car
b) waiting at a practice of some kind like soccer or dancing, at grandma's.
c)Do you read in the car?

Others

16. Does anyone read to you at home?

Probe: Do you like it?
Tell me about it / How come?

Probe: Do you ever ask to be read to?
Tell me about it / How come?

Ownership/Access

17. Do you pick out the books you want to read?

Ownership/Access

18. Do you own the books (or whatever, on the basis of previous responses) that you read?

Ownership/Access/Affect

Probe: Do you usually get your books from school, a bookstore or the public library?

Probe: Do you go to the library to get books too?

Probe: Do you enjoy going there?

Probe: Or do you get them as gifts or from a book club?

Others

19. Is knowing how to read important in your family? Why?

The next few questions will be about reading at school...

School

Genre/Affect

20. Do you read in school?

Probe: Do you enjoy reading at school?

Probe: Do you get a choice in what you read in school?
a) Novels?
b) Social Studies?
c) Book clubs?

Probe: Would you like to read more?
Tell me about it / How come?

Genre/Affect 21. Do you like reading some stories over and over again in school?

Probe: What makes a book a favourite?

Genre/Affect 22. Do you like storybooks?

Probe: Tell me about it/How come?

Genre/Affect 23. Do you like finding out/information books?

Probe: Tell me about it/How come?

Genre/Affect 24. Which do you like better, science or storybooks? How come?

Affect/Method/Others 25. Does your teacher ask you questions about what you read?

Probe: Do you like that?
Tell me about it/ How come?

26. Do you get a chance to read on your own at school everyday?

Probe: Do you like that?

27. Do you read on the computer?

Probe Is that cool? How come?

28. Do you know lots of words? How come?

Finally, the last few questions, and they are about other people in your life like your friends...

Significant others – i.e. peers

Gender 29. Do boys/girls like to read?

Probe: Tell me about it / How come?

Probe: Do you think boys like to read more than girls?

Probe: Do you see more boys reading than girls?

Others 30. Does anybody ever tease you about your reading?

Probe: How come?
a) Because you read too much?
b) Because you don't read enough?
Probe: What do you think about that?

Others 31. What about your friends, do they read?

Probe: What do they read?

Others 32. Do you and your friends talk about reading?

Probe Tell me about it/How come?

Do you have any questions for me?

Are you sure?

I have an interesting one and it is about reading. We have been talking about what you like to read, where you like to read, about reading and your friends and all of that...but we didn't talk about what reading is. What is reading? Tell me what reading is.

APPENDIX D

POSSIBLE CATEGORIES BASED ON PILOT RESPONSES TO THE CARP

The following list is a record of the possible categories or topics that might have been expected from participants of the CARP based on the responses of a pilot student.

Category	Question	Research categories
Text Subject	1, 2, 18, 20	1, 2 (Self-perception), 18, 20 (School)
Family	3, 7, 9, 10, 14, 17, 18,	3, 7, 9 (Self-perception), 10,14, 17 (Home) 18 (School)
Location	4, 7, 13,	4, 7 (Self-perception), 13 (Home)
Learning to Read	3, 11,	3, (Self—perception), 11 (Home)
Time	5,	5 (Home)
Affect	6, 8, 13, 14,16, 18,	6, 8 (Self-perception),13,14,16 (Home) 18 (School)
Ability	9	9 (Home)
Teacher	9, 23	9 (Home), 23 (School)
Friends	29, 30	29, 30 (Significant others/peers)
Access	13, 15, 16, 18,	13, 15, 16 (Home), 18 (School)
Ownership	16	16 (Home)
School	18	18 (School)
General Reading	19	19 (School)
Computer	25	25 (School)
Boys	27	27 (Significant Others/peers)
Girls	27	27 (Significant Others/peers)
Teasing	28	28 (Significant Others/peers)